

NAYS—15

Black
Blease
Brookhart
Copeland

Dale
George
Greene
Harrison

Hawes
King
McKellar
Ransdell

Sheppard
Steck
Tyson

NOT VOTING—18

Ashurst
Borah
Bratton
Broussard
Caraway

Edge
Glass
Gould
Hayden
Kendrick

Moses
Phipps
Reed
Robinson, Ark.
Shipstead

Stephens
Thomas, Idaho
Wagner

So Mr. JOHNSON'S motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, May 25, 1929, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, May 24, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, O Lord, that the golden fingers of sunrise have brought us the glory of a new day. Upon Thy altar we would pour the incense of our gratitude. There, in the midst of labor and responsibility, we find the serenity of the soul. Do Thou let fall upon us the leaves of Thy healing and blessing. Regard the sweet sentiments and good thoughts that bloom in our hearts and minds; unuttered and unexpressed they lie in silence there. In the performance of duty, help us to be resourceful and equal to its call. Dear Lord God, may we be men who can. Through Christ the world's Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 616. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the world jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America.

WORLD JAMBOREE OF THE BOY SCOUTS

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 616) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the world jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider the bill S. 616, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to lend, at his discretion, to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, for use at the world jamboree, Boy Scouts, to be held at Birkenhead, England, in the months of July and August, 1929, 1,600 cots, 5,000 blankets, tentage for 1,600 scouts: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of the said convention as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War before delivering said property shall take from the said Boy Scouts of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman to state to the House, as he stated to me a moment ago, in substance, that this bill has been submitted to the War Department and has its approval?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; it has.

Mr. GARNER. And that the gentleman has spoken to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN]?

Mr. HUGHES. That is correct.

Mr. GARNER. And that this bill has the approval of both those gentlemen?

Mr. HUGHES. That is correct.

Mr. TILSON. When is this meeting to be held?

Mr. HUGHES. In July and August of this year.

Mr. TILSON. So that it is an emergency measure?

Mr. HUGHES. It is.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, where is this meeting to be held?

Mr. HUGHES. In England.

Mr. McKEOWN. Why do not the English furnish this equipment, if the meeting is to be held in their country?

Mr. HUGHES. It is surely not necessary for England to furnish equipment for American boys. In practically all of the other countries their expenses are being paid, but the Boy Scouts of America are not asking for any expense at all. They are merely asking for the loan of this equipment, which is now in storage, and it will do no harm to the equipment. In fact, it will help it. This has the approval of the War Department.

Mr. McKEOWN. I am not objecting to the proposition, except I wanted to know why we had to furnish this equipment. If the meeting had been held over here, I am sure that we would have furnished equipment to all of them.

Mr. HUGHES. I have always been interested in boy scouts, and one good reason was that Col. C. H. Livingston, who has been my personal and close friend for 30 years, with W. D. Boyer, of Chicago, organized the Boy Scouts of America in Washington, D. C., and throughout the entire United States February, 1910. To Colonel Livingston, of West Virginia—my own State—is due the highest credit for the great work done by him and the associates he gathered about him to promote this most useful and influential organization for the training of boys in good citizenship. I am glad to contribute my effort to help along this great cause for the Boy Scouts of this country.

The Boy Scouts of America have been invited to send 1,600 boys and leaders to the World Conference on International Good Will, to be held at Birkenhead, England, beginning July 30 and ending August 13, 1929. I am reliably informed there will be 50,000 Boy Scouts representing 42 nations in attendance. The American Boy Scouts' organization has 2,200 applicants who are anxious to participate in this world celebration.

The American organization has decided that it will be necessary to arrange accommodations for at least 1,600 American boys. It is essential that tents, cots, blankets, mess kits, and the most necessary camping equipment be provided for.

I am informed by the secretary and editor of the Boy Scouts' organization of America, Mr. E. S. Martin, that many of the countries who are to send Boy Scouts to this jamboree are financing the expedition. The American organization needs no assistance financially and are only interested in securing cooperation from the Federal Government to the extent of borrowing from the Army camping equipment, which this bill 616 authorizes.

A survey has been made and it is found that the Army supply base located at Brooklyn has an abundance of material available in storage, if any authority can be had that will permit the War Department to extend the courtesy of loaning this equipment to the American Boy Scouts' organization. There is no opposition by the War Department and the bill was unanimously reported out from the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate.

The National Council of the American Boy Scouts' organization, incorporated by Congress, will transport such equipment that may be loaned to them by the War Department and furnish bond for its safe return, with no expense whatever to the Government. It is definitely understood that there will be no expense to the Government for the transportation, and the return of this property will be underwritten and guaranteed by the organization.

The Boy Scouts will come from every section of the United States, from California to Maine, and represent in membership a million boys and men.

The information which I present to the House has attached to it the names of Frank Presbrey, chairman, Mortimer L. Schiff, George D. Pratt, James E. West, and D. C. Beard.

We are all familiar more or less with the activities and the aims of the boy-scout movement of America. It might not be amiss to give a brief summary of their past activities.

At a time in our country's history it was necessary to call upon the man power of this Nation almost to the limit. The four Liberty loan campaigns were aided by this organization of Boy Scouts to the extent of securing 1,867,047 subscriptions amounting to \$278,744,650.

War-savings stamps were sold by the members of this organization amounting to \$42,751,031.25 in 2,175,625 sales, and other accomplishments too numerous to mention, which, in my judgment, justifies the unanimous consent asked for in the consideration of this bill without giving any thought of their future record as to what it will mean in encouragement of greater accomplishment and in the developing of character and patriotism by the Government at least contributing in this small way

to assure the comfort of these young Americans who are to join in this celebration.

I want to take this opportunity to call attention to good and valuable service rendered this great organization by a citizen of our own city—J. Roy Marcum. His work for the Boy Scouts of Huntington can not be estimated. He bought a small farm and takes 75 or 100 to this camp every summer and gives these boys a good start in life. He also adds to their physical condition by giving them an outing they could not otherwise get; then he keeps in close touch with those boys at all times, and the training and advice he gives them can be noticed in their daily walks of life.

Senator H. D. HATFIELD, who is always on the alert for all things that will aid any organization which organizes for the good of the country, is a strong friend of the Boy Scouts of America. He passed the bill in the Senate, and I am now asking that it be taken up in the House for immediate consideration, because this meeting is to be held at Birkenhead, England, during July and August of this year. And this is why I am asking the House to pass this bill at this time. It is an emergency measure. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE TARIFF

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 46, a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2667, entitled "A bill to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes"; that general debate on the bill be now closed; that the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, but committee amendments to any part of the bill shall be in order at any time; that consideration of the bill for amendment shall continue until Tuesday, May 28, 1929, at 3 o'clock p. m., at which time the bill with all amendments that shall have been adopted by the Committee of the Whole shall be reported to the House, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The vote on all amendments shall be taken en gros except when a separate vote is demanded by the Committee on Ways and Means on an amendment offered by said committee.

That said bill shall be the continuing order until its consideration is concluded, subject only to conference reports, privileged matters on the Speaker's table, and reports from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, pending the discussion of this resolution, I desire to arrive at some agreement with my friend from North Carolina [Mr. POU] as to time.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, this rule is a very important rule. We would like some time to discuss it on this side of the House. We would like to have an hour on this side, if the gentleman can agree to that.

Mr. SNELL. I thought that we could get along with the usual hour that is given to resolutions of this kind. I think we have never had to exceed an hour for the consideration of one of these resolutions. I want to be as agreeable as I can to the gentleman under the circumstances.

Mr. POU. The debate upon the bill has extended over quite a long time and I am putting it rather mildly, I think, when I say that this is a rather drastic rule.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, I have thought right along that it is a very liberal one.

Mr. POU. I think I could help the gentleman draw a more liberal rule than this and I would have done so, if he had asked me.

Mr. SNELL. I want to do what is fair with the gentleman. Would he be satisfied if we had 45 minutes on a side?

Mr. POU. We will try to get along with that.

Mr. SNELL. Of course, if the rule is debated for any time, it takes just so much more time from the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule. Would the gentleman be willing to consent to have the previous question ordered at the conclusion of the debate?

Mr. POU. Oh, no; we could not agree to that.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I am in a liberal frame of mind this morning. I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon this resolution be limited to one hour and a half, 45 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], and 45 minutes by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that debate upon the resolution be limited to one hour and a half, 45 minutes to be controlled by himself and 45 minutes by the gentleman from North Carolina. Is there objection?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, about these amendments that are to be offered under the 5-minute rule, are they to be controlled entirely by the committee? Are they to be committee amendments?

Mr. SNELL. That is a question that I shall answer when I come to the discussion of the rule.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think a great many of us who might want to offer amendments would want to know that now.

Mr. SNELL. That has nothing whatever to do with the proposition before the House at the present time as to the amount of time we shall use in the discussion of the resolution.

Mr. EDWARDS. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution just presented at the Clerk's desk provides for the orderly consideration of the bill H. R. 2667, which is commonly referred to as the Hawley tariff revision measure. This resolution provides that the House shall automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and that the consideration of the bill shall be immediately begun under the 5-minute rule; that amendments offered by the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered at any time to any part of the bill during the consideration under the 5-minute rule. And I want to say here, in answer to a question that has been asked me several times this morning, that when an amendment is offered by the Committee on Ways and Means, any germane amendment to that committee amendment may be offered by any Member of the House.

The rule further provides that a final vote shall be taken on the bill and all amendments at 3 o'clock on Tuesday, May 28; that all amendments shall be voted on in gross, except when a separate vote is demanded by the Committee on Ways and Means.

I will say to the Members of the House that the Republican members of the Committee on Rules, in presenting this rule, have followed the precedents and the practice which have been followed in this House for practically the last 50 years. There is nothing new in the way provided or in the principle involved in the rule.

Probably the new Members of the House, the Members who were not present during the consideration of the last tariff bill, or who have not had the time to look up the conditions under which tariff bills have always been passed, ought to be enlightened at this time; and I desire to state to the membership of the House the exact conditions under which all of the tariff bills have been passed in the last 50 years; yes, in the last 75 years. This is the tenth general or partial revision of the tariff.

The first revision of the tariff in that time was passed in the Forty-fourth Congress, with one day of general debate. The next revision of the tariff was passed in the Forty-sixth Congress, with parts of six days. The third revision bill, in the Forty-eighth Congress, had no debate whatever, but the enacting clause was stricken out of the bill. The fourth revision, which was one of the principal revisions ever passed, was the McKinley bill, in 1890. That bill was passed under a special rule in general respects similar to the one presented here to-day. The next revision of the tariff was the Wilson bill, in 1894. That was the first Democratic revision; and I want you gentlemen on the other side, who I know are going to find fault with this rule, to give some attention to the rule that you passed yourselves for the consideration of your tariff bill.

That rule provided that the whole bill should be read through immediately. It did not provide for any definite consideration under the 5-minute rule at all, and with a Democratic chairman in the chair, he would recognize a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and every time that man was recognized, he was entitled to one hour; and as the rule fixed a definite time for the final vote on the bill, the practical effect was that the individual Member never had any opportunity to offer any amendment.

In addition to that, when that bill came back from the Senate it contained 637 definite amendments, and 15 minutes' debate was allowed on each side, and you passed them in gross. That represented the fairness and the generosity of the Democratic Party when they are considering a tariff measure.

The Dingley bill of 1897 was passed under a rule similar to the one we are presenting. The Payne-Aldrich tariff bill of 1909 was passed under a special rule.

Then we come to the Underwood tariff bill, the second time the Democrats ever revised the tariff. How was that bill passed? You had a caucus. You bound every man in that caucus to support every amendment that was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and also to oppose every amendment that was offered by anybody else on the floor of the House, while in the conference that the Republicans had yesterday the only thing that we asked them to bind themselves to, or agree on, was simply a method by which we should consider this bill. We did not ask a single Member on this side of the House to bind himself to vote for or against a single amendment or on the final passage of the bill. The only thing the Republicans have agreed on is the way and the method by which we will consider this measure at the present time.

There is nothing new or novel in the rule. We are providing the normal way of passing a tariff bill. In my judgment what the country wants now is less talk and more action by Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. In a moment.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], every time he has taken the floor in the last few days, has said he wanted action on the tariff bill. The rule that we have presented will give you action on the tariff bill. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman seems to be criticizing the Democratic Congresses in the past and their method of passing tariff bills.

Mr. SNELL. No; I am not criticizing, but I was stating to the House that the Democrats always passed them under rigid restrictions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The gentleman thought the Democratic action was fair?

Mr. SNELL. No; I did not say that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought the gentleman had indorsed the Democratic action.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman has spoken of a number of rules for the consideration of tariff bills. Is not this the first rule ever presented to the House that absolutely denies the right of offering any amendment except such amendments as are offered by the Committee on Ways and Means? And is it not the first rule that requires that amendments shall be voted upon in gross when the bill came back to the House?

Mr. SNELL. Part of your statement is true and part of it is not. I am going to be absolutely fair to the House. From the way you tied them up by your caucus rule, to the outside public you seemed to be more generous, but as a matter of fact you were more stringent than we are in this rule, and you on that side as well as we on this side know that it is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, in every great debate there are certain contested questions which are brought to the top. In this debate, which has extended over several days, I think it is very manifest there are certain sections in the bill under consideration upon which a large membership of this House would like to express themselves. First of all, there is a sentiment in the House to express itself on the so-called debenture proposal. Under this rule there will be no chance whatever for a vote on it. There is a proposal in this bill to increase the cost of living to the American people on the consumption of sugar in a sum that has been put all the way from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000.

One thing is certain, if this bill becomes a law every family in America will be taxed by reason of this advance in the sugar schedule. There are gentlemen on both sides of the aisle who are utterly opposed to the increase in sugar duties who would like an opportunity of voting upon such increase. You will not get a chance under this rule. There will be no

record vote showing how Members stood with respect to the proposed advance in sugar duties.

In this bill there is section 338, which gives to the President of the United States greater power than is exercised by any king, potentate, or ruler on this planet. [Applause.] The House is proposing to abdicate the authority conferred upon it by the Constitution and give to the President of the United States not only the right to increase old duties but to levy new duties. I have often wondered, during my 28 years of service as a Member of this body, why it is that on the trains and in the lobbies of hotels, and elsewhere, whenever you talk about Congressmen there is often a sneering smile.

I think one reason is because we do just such things as this. [Applause.] You invite contempt when you voluntarily offered to surrender the authority conferred upon this great body, the greatest legislative body in the world. Men should be prouder of membership here than in any legislative body in the world, because the House of Representatives is the most powerful and important legislative body in the whole world. But you will never regain the respect of the American people by surrendering power and authority which the Constitution conferred upon this body. You will never command respect by dodging record votes. The purpose of the special rule we are now considering is to prevent record votes. Why not allow the American people to know the names of the Members who are fighting for higher sugar duties? Why not have a record vote on section 338, which confers upon the President powers far greater than the framers of the Constitution ever dreamed any President would ever be permitted to exercise? If that section becomes law we abdicate and the President takes our place. It will be an admission of incompetence, an admission that we consider ourselves unfit to exercise the high prerogatives conferred upon us by the Constitution of the country. I protest against it. In simple fairness to all there should be a record vote on section 338, but under this rule there will be no opportunity for a record vote. Indeed, there will be no separate vote of any kind on section 338. You have to swallow the whole bill, unless the members of the Ways and Means Committee decide to offer an amendment striking out section 338, which, of course, they will not do.

The picture has changed, Mr. Speaker, in the last few days. This special session of Congress was called for the purpose of providing some measure of relief to the agriculture of the country. Lo and behold, when the machine got to work the manufacturers of the Nation presumed we had been called in extra session to raise import duties higher than they have ever been in the history of the Nation. Duties high enough to cover the difference in cost here and abroad, with a margin in favor of our own manufacturers, did not provide adequate protection. Even higher duties were demanded. Representatives of American manufacturing industry came to Washington, 1,100 strong, and said, "If you do not raise these ruinous tariff duties above where they are now these foreigners may put some of us out of business." The report informs us that 1,100 persons were heard orally by the Ways and Means Committee and about 300 filed printed briefs. Of the 1,400 persons who were heard by the committee, it would be interesting to know just how many were directly or indirectly interested in the higher duties demanded. It would also be interesting to know just how many had no interest in higher duties but appeared solely in behalf of the best interests of the American people. The light shed by these hearings was, of course, colored by self-interest.

After the hearings the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, in secret, commenced the work of revising tariff schedules. The result is this bill, which will increase the cost of living of every human being in America. Up still higher goes the tariff wall, and section 338 provides, in general terms, that if the President of the United States shall ever decide to do so he can raise duties still higher without your consent. You give to the President the power to make new laws without any action by Congress.

Gentlemen, I care not what your politics are, I submit you should pause and consider what you are proceeding to do. No President should be clothed with the law-making power. At least give the House an opportunity of voting on such a far-reaching proposal.

This session of Congress, called for the purpose of relieving the agriculture of America, has been changed into a Congress which has now reported the highest tariff bill ever considered by any American Congress. The bill that you are going to be compelled to swallow without amendment is the apotheosis of selfishness. We should at least have an opportunity of voting

upon these questions which during this great debate have forced themselves to the front. I care not what the precedent is and I care not what the custom of the past has been, I say that upon the propositions I have mentioned, even in spite of precedents and in spite of tradition, this House should be given an opportunity to vote. But the steam roller is at work, gentlemen. Your opportunity will be to vote down the previous question. If you vote it down, this rule can be amended, but if you do not vote the previous question down, then this measure, which abdicates authority so far as the Congress is concerned and which puts a tax upon the American people greater than was ever dreamed of in the past, must be voted upon without an opportunity of amendment. All the amendments must be voted upon en gros. I submit such action can not be defended if we are here legislating in behalf of all the people of America. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER]. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, in five minutes it will be impossible to discuss other than briefly the effect of this rule. I want the membership on the Republican side of the House especially to understand the effect of this rule. When the Members on the Republican side return to their constituencies and the query is made to them why they did not offer amendments to this bill, I want to impress upon them the importance of giving the exact situation as it is at the present time. I do not want you Republicans to say to your constituents that you did not have an opportunity of offering amendments to this bill, because you will have that opportunity to offer amendments unless you take that right away from yourselves. I want you Members who have made speeches here against the sugar schedule—and I see the distinguished lady from New York [Mrs. PRATT] coming down the aisle at this moment, who made a very forceful statement upon that schedule to the House of Representatives. [Applause.] She urged her Republican colleagues of the House, as well as the Democratic side of the House, not to tax the American people on a necessity of life, such as sugar, as proposed in this bill.

Now, madam, when you go back to your constituency, and you have not offered that amendment, I want you to tell them that you deliberately took away from yourself the right to offer such an amendment because the exigencies of your party appealed more to you than the patriotism of yourself to your country. [Applause.]

Mrs. RUTH PRATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I yield, with pleasure.

Mrs. RUTH PRATT. I wish to answer that statement by saying that New York is one place that understands that perfectly. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. Then I understand the lady to say that in the State of New York it is already understood that party allegiance is worth more than your patriotism to your country. That is not so in Texas. [Applause.] It was illustrated last year that it was not so in Texas; and when you vote for this rule which takes away from you, and from each Member of this House, all opportunity to offer a sugar amendment, a shingle amendment, a cement amendment, a brick amendment, a lumber amendment, or an amendment with respect to anything else, do not go back and tell your constituencies that you intended to do it and that you wanted to amend the bill but you did not have the opportunity, because such a statement will not be the truth.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GARNER. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman says to the House that the course of Texas in the last presidential election was necessarily a patriotic move? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GARNER. Oh, the gentleman from Michigan would divert me from talking about what he is trying to do to himself now. [Applause.] The gentleman wants to divert me to the Texas political problem from the question of the submission to the House of an opportunity to get a vote on the items in this bill.

There is not a Member of the House who can say in his conscience that he thinks this is a proper way to legislate on this or on any other bill. You are taking away from the House of Representatives all opportunity to express itself on the various amendments.

Why, I have heard here in the last two weeks 100 men declare themselves for this, that, or the other amendment which they would like to have put in this bill.

Now, what are you going to say to your constituencies? Are you going to say, "I advocated on the floor of the House this, that, or the other policy; I wanted to amend the bill, but I did not have the opportunity"? "Why?" "Because I voted to take away from myself all opportunity to offer such amendment." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that I can not go along with the majority of my party on this rule. Having taken the attitude I have on certain schedules, I can not consistently foreclose myself by supporting this rule.

It is of no benefit to the people that I represent to have the opportunity to register their protest in general debate if I am foreclosed as a Member of Congress from offering an amendment to protect their interests. [Applause.]

I submit to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], that it is of very little comfort to me to be told that this rule should be supported because some time in the past the Democrats had a similar rule. A bad precedent is no justification for a vicious rule. We should correct the mistakes of the Democrats and not repeat them. Conditions were different in 1890. Conditions were different at every time a tariff bill was before this House, with the exception of the Underwood bill, and the rules of the House were different. The rules of the House in those times were so arbitrary, and they continued to be so arbitrary and destructive of representative government, that the people of this country resented it and the rules of the House became a political issue. That issue went before the people in an election and a Congress was elected that revised the rules of the House. It was just such arbitrary parliamentary conduct as is proposed in this rule which brought about the resentment and a subsequent change.

I submit that as a Member of Congress I have an equal right with every other Member of Congress to initiate or originate any amendment without waiting for an opportunity for the door to be opened by the Ways and Means Committee of this House. [Applause.]

I submit, gentlemen, you have repeatedly argued that a majority should control, and I agree with that—

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield right there on that statement?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In just a moment. I say that a majority should rule, and when you have a number on your side which together with a number on this side constitutes a majority, you have no right to thwart the will of that majority. [Applause.]

I am willing to vote for a protective tariff to equalize the difference in the cost of production and the wages paid to American labor, but I can not justify to my people a tariff on commodities that are not imported into this country.

You have increased the duty on butter, and there is no Danish butter or any other kind imported into the country in any large amounts at this time. You have increased the duty on potatoes, and there is not one-half of 1 per cent of the consumption of potatoes imported into the country at this time. You have increased the duty on sugar, which is entirely unjustifiable. You have increased the duty on tomatoes. You have increased the duty on onions, and not 2 per cent of the total consumption of onions is imported into this country. There is an increase on meat. All these increases will do the farmer no good and will increase the now unbearably high cost of living.

You should at least give us the opportunity to initiate amendments and let the majority of this House decide. My friends, I want to say that the mere fact you bring in a rule cutting off the opportunity of offering amendments would indicate that there is danger that many of these schedules do not meet with the approval of a majority of the House and therefore not with the approval of the American people. That is absolutely true of the sugar tariff increase.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. Judging from the gentleman's very general criticism of the bill, I judge what he wants is not a chance to offer amendments but a chance to vote against the bill.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Anyone from the sugar bloc is the last person in the world to question anybody on this bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate conferees on the farm bill are insisting that the House take a direct vote on the debenture plan. Under the situation in which the two Houses find themselves that is the most natural and most reasonable request that could be made. And the House conferees are refusing to permit the House to vote on the debenture plan. Under the circumstances that is the most untenable position which could be assumed. Here we have the conferees of the House which has not voted directly on a proposition demanding that the House which has voted on it after long consideration and deliberation recede on first conference. The position of the House conferees is indefensible. It is inconsistent, illogical, and contrary to conference customs.

Now, why are the House conferees refusing the House an opportunity to vote on the debenture plan? Why should they refuse to permit the Members of the House to express their views on the most widely discussed issue before the American people to-day, a proposition to which the Senate after exhaustive debate has just agreed? Why is it that from the opening of this session, called for the particular purpose of equalizing the farmer's tariff benefits with industry's tariff benefits, they have refused to allow us to vote on the debenture plan, the equalization fee, or any other method of giving the farmer the benefit of the tariff? The answer is obvious. The well-informed gentlemen who are running the steam roller in this Congress know that a large majority of both parties favor some measure to make the tariff effective, and the debenture plan will carry if allowed to come to a vote, and that although we have been in session since April 15 they have never at any time since we convened allowed the House to take a vote on the equalization fee or the debenture plan, or any proposition which would make the tariff effective on surplus farm products.

And why do the rest of us want to vote on the debenture plan? I will be very frank with you. We want to vote on the debenture plan because we are looking forward to the campaigns of 1930 and 1932. We want every farmer in the United States to know how his Representative stands on this proposition. We insist that the voters know before they go to the polls again whether their Congressman voted to give the farmer the benefit of the tariff and put agriculture on a plane of economic equality with industry, or whether he voted to deny the farmer the benefit of the tariff and keep the farmer buying in a protected market to provide an American standard of living for labor and industry and selling in an unprotected world market in competition with the half-clad natives of Asia and South America.

Every Member of this House who spoke in the rural districts in the last campaign told the farmer that the tariff was the solution of the farm problem. And they promised the farmer that the tariff would be invoked to advance the price of farm products which the farmer sells just as it has all along been used to advance the price of industrial products which the farmer buys. And every one of you promised the farmer that you would come back here and vote to give the farmer the benefit of the tariff. How are you keeping that promise?

There is not a line in the farm bill, there is not a line in the tariff bill that will make the tariff effective. Not a word that proposes to carry out your solemn pledges to the farmer to give him his fair share of the national income. Why, you are even afraid to vote on it. Are you ashamed to go on record so your constituents back home will know that you repudiated the promises you made them? That must be the inference, for this rule is carefully drawn for the specific purpose of preventing any amendments or any proposals to make farm tariffs effective on surplus products.

The tariff is not effective on surplus farm products and never has been. Not a man here will rise and claim that the farmer gets the benefit of the tariff on wheat or corn or hogs or cotton or any other product of which we produce an exportable surplus. The very fact that you refuse to vote on the debenture plan proves that the tariff is not effective. If the tariff was effective on wheat, for instance, the farmer would receive 42 cents a bushel above the world price under the present tariff law.

If the debenture plan goes into operation the farmer will receive only 21 cents a bushel above the world price. If the tariff of 42 cents a bushel was effective no farmer would want the debenture plan. For who would discard a law giving him 42

cents above the world price for a plan giving him only 21 cents above the world price? After promising the farmer the tariff you are unwilling to give him even half the tariff. And when you vote for this rule eliminating the last hope of a vote on adding the debenture plan to this bill you are voting against the last opportunity to give the farmer even half the tariff you promised him.

As a matter of fact, the farmer is to-day receiving no benefit whatever from the tariff on wheat. Wheat might just as well be on the free list. And if wheat were put on the free list without a penny's tariff the farmer would receive just as much for his crop this fall as he will receive under the present tariff of 42 cents a bushel.

In other words, every man who votes for the farm bill and for the tariff bill in their present form without voting to add the debenture plan or some other plan to effectuate the tariff is a free trader on surplus farm products. Neither of these bills gives the farmer an effective tariff to the amount of a penny on his surplus crops. In this bill you are giving industry the highest tariffs ever carried by any tariff bill in the history of the American Congress. On industrial products you are high-tariff men. The sky is the limit. But on surplus farm products you are against any tariff benefits at all. On farm products you are free traders, pure and simple.

The market reports for the last six weeks are highly significant. They constitute the most convincing proof—if proof were needed—of the ineffectiveness of the so-called farm legislation you are jamming through the House for the alleged benefit of the farmer. Let us take wheat for example. Since this session convened wheat has dropped over 30 cents per bushel. The speculators manipulating the wheat market are astute gentlemen. If Congress had passed a law which they thought would increase the price of wheat they would have been the first to take advantage of it and wheat would have climbed 30 cents instead of falling 30 cents. In fact, some of them took your campaign promises too literally, and thinking you really intended to do something for the farmer jumped in and bought wheat to their sorrow, as indicated in the following comment from one of Senator CAPPER's excellent farm periodicals, the Missouri Ruralist:

DISAPPOINTED WHEAT HOLDERS

Speculative interests, whose buying in anticipation of farm relief legislation was chiefly responsible for an 8-cent rally in wheat, were disappointed with the bill submitted and the President's message to Congress, causing the upturn to be speedily lost. Crop and merchandising conditions furnished but little incentive for higher prices.

These influences forced prices again down close to the low point of the season.

Corn prices also declined when farm relief measures were announced.

Market reports simultaneously issued by the Associated Press also confirm the drop in farm prices coincident with the announcement of the administration's farm policy:

FRESH PRICE BREAKS RECORDED IN WHEAT—BREAKING OF SEASON'S LOW MARKS TAKES PLACE WITH GENERAL LACK OF DEMAND

CHICAGO, April 22.—Fresh breaking of season low-price records for wheat took place early to-day, accompanied by general selling and lack of demand.

On top of uncertainties regarding farm relief legislation lower Liverpool quotations than were looked for tended to increase general selling of wheat.

It soon became apparent to those on the inside that no real effort would be made to redeem campaign promises, and wheat immediately began to fall and dropped from the high spring price of \$1.35½ a bushel to the low price of \$1.02 a bushel, the lowest price to which wheat has fallen since 1914. With wheat and other surplus farm products steadily dropping to the lowest prices since before the war, at the very time when Congress is passing a law to help the farmer, how can anyone consistently contend that such a law redeems the campaign pledges of either party? It is a farce and a base deception on the face of it. And you are voting to perpetuate that deception when you vote for this rule.

Why has wheat been falling? Because the farmer has no tariff protection against foreign competition. Because he must accept a world price for his wheat. Here are two typical market reports set out by the Associated Press, showing unmistakably the failure of the farm tariff and the control of the domestic market by the world market:

WHEAT VALUES DROP—WEAKNESS OF EUROPEAN MARKETS REFLECTED IN SETBACK AT CHICAGO

CHICAGO, May 7.—General selling on account of increased weakness of European markets carried wheat, corn, and rye down to new low-price records for the season.

In a fresh selling flurry that for a time to-day overwhelmed the grain markets all deliveries of wheat and rye outdid previous bottom prices for the present crop. Corn also broke the season's low-price record. In addition to the circumstance that the Liverpool wheat market to-day was much weaker than expected, the fact was pointed out by leading grain authorities here that Canada already has 12,000,000 bushels of wheat waiting at Canadian seaports, 15,000,000 at United States Lake ports, and 11,000,000 bushels at United States Atlantic ports.

It was said this totaled 38,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat already available for any seaboard demand before the United States could begin to move the domestic surplus down to the same point of availability.

WHEAT PRICES SINK TO NEW LOW MARK—WEAKNESS AT LIVERPOOL AND FAVORABLE CROP REPORTS DEPRESS MARKET

CHICAGO, May 22.—New low price records for the season accompanied foreign selling to-day in the wheat market here. Weakness of wheat quotations at Liverpool, acted as a bearish influence.

Supplementing the depressing effect of selling of wheat future deliveries in Chicago to-day on the part of foreigners, advices were at hand indicating that for at least the time being European demand for wheat from the United States was reduced practically to zero. In this connection it was asserted that Argentine shippers were pressing their August delivery at 10 cents under September delivery to this country.

At Liverpool demand was poor, and growth conditions throughout Europe were reported improved.

Every market report sent out through the daily press throughout the year emphasizes the fact that the price of wheat in the United States is controlled by the world price, and that the wheat markets of America fluctuate constantly with the rise and fall of the price of wheat on the Liverpool and other European markets, and that the tariff of 42 cents a bushel on wheat has no more effect on the price received by the producer than an enactment of Congress would have on the temperature of the Arctic seas.

But Congress can protect the farmer if it wishes. The Members of this House can redeem their campaign promises if they will. All you have to do is to add the debenture plan to the farm bill or the tariff bill and, over night, the price of wheat will jump 21 cents above the world price. Vote down this rule and give the House a chance to vote on the debenture plan and immediately you will have made the tariff on surplus farm products one-half effective.

The shameless deception practiced on the farmer in professing to give him a tariff on wheat is apparent from a glance at comparative tables of the Canadian and American markets. At Minneapolis in the United States the tariff of 42 cents a bushel is in effect. At Winnipeg, just a few miles away, but across the line in Canada, there is no tariff. And yet for the last year the same grade of wheat has sold for more in Canada than in the United States.

Comparative prices of No. 1 northern spring wheat at Minneapolis and Winnipeg, as reported in the Chicago Tribune

Date	Minneapolis	Winnipeg
1928		
Mar. 1	\$1.28 1/2	\$1.44 1/2
Mar. 2	1.28 1/2	1.44 1/2
Mar. 3	1.29	1.46
Mar. 4	1.29 1/2	1.46 1/2
Mar. 5	1.31 1/2	1.48 1/2
Mar. 6	1.30 1/2	1.47 1/2
Mar. 7	1.31 1/2	1.48 1/2
Mar. 8	1.30 1/2	1.47 1/2
Mar. 9	1.29 1/2	1.46 1/2
Mar. 10	1.29 1/2	1.46 1/2
Mar. 11	1.29 1/2	1.47
Mar. 12	1.30 1/2	1.47 1/2
Mar. 13	1.31	1.48
Mar. 14	1.30 1/2	1.47 1/2
Mar. 15	1.30 1/2	1.47 1/2
Mar. 16	1.31 1/2	1.48 1/2
Mar. 17	1.31 1/2	1.48 1/2
Mar. 18	1.31 1/2	1.48 1/2
Mar. 19	1.31 1/2	1.48 1/2
Mar. 20	1.31 1/2	1.48 1/2
Mar. 21	1.32 1/2	1.49 1/2
Mar. 22	1.32 1/2	1.49 1/2
Mar. 23	1.32 1/2	1.49 1/2
Mar. 24	1.31 1/2	1.48 1/2
Mar. 25	1.31 1/2	1.48 1/2
Mar. 26	1.32	1.48 1/2
Mar. 27	1.32 1/2	1.48 1/2
Mar. 28	1.32 1/2	1.48 1/2
Mar. 29	1.33 1/2	1.49 1/2
Mar. 30	1.35 1/2	1.50 1/2
Mar. 31	1.34 1/2	1.50
Apr. 1	1.35	1.50 1/2
Apr. 2	1.34 1/2	1.50 1/2
Apr. 3	1.36	1.51 1/2
Apr. 4	1.35 1/2	1.51 1/2
Apr. 5	1.35 1/2	1.51 1/2
Apr. 6	1.34 1/2	1.51 1/2
Apr. 7	1.35 1/2	1.50 1/2
Apr. 8	1.35 1/2	1.50 1/2
Apr. 9	1.35 1/2	1.50 1/2
Apr. 10	1.36 1/2	1.50 1/2
Apr. 11	1.36 1/2	1.50 1/2
Apr. 12	1.41 1/2	1.54 1/2
Apr. 13	1.41 1/2	1.54 1/2
Apr. 14	1.44 1/2	1.56 1/2

Comparative prices of No. 1 northern spring wheat at Minneapolis and Winnipeg, as reported in the Chicago Tribune—Continued

Date	Minneapolis	Winnipeg
1928		
Apr. 15	\$1.46 1/2	\$1.59
Apr. 16	1.48 1/2	1.60 1/2
Apr. 17	1.46	1.57 1/2
Apr. 18	1.48 1/2	1.59 1/2
Apr. 19	1.50 1/2	1.59
Apr. 20	1.46 1/2	1.56
Apr. 21	1.45 1/2	1.55 1/2
Apr. 22	1.47 1/2	1.56
Apr. 23	1.48 1/2	1.57 1/2
Apr. 24	1.52 1/2	1.59 1/2
Apr. 25	1.51 1/2	1.59 1/2
Apr. 26	1.55 1/2	1.63 1/2
Apr. 27	1.58 1/2	1.64 1/2
Apr. 28	1.58 1/2	1.64 1/2
Apr. 29	1.62 1/2	1.65 1/2
May 1	1.58 1/2	1.64 1/2
May 2	1.55	1.62 1/2
May 3	1.51 1/2	1.59 1/2
May 4	1.51	1.61 1/2
May 5	1.54 1/2	1.64 1/2
May 6	1.55 1/2	1.63 1/2
May 7	1.54 1/2	1.62 1/2
May 8	1.48 1/2	1.59 1/2
May 9	1.49 1/2	1.60
May 10	1.46 1/2	1.57 1/2
May 11	1.45 1/2	1.54 1/2
May 12	1.47 1/2	1.57 1/2
May 13	1.45 1/2	1.54 1/2
May 14	1.43 1/2	1.52 1/2
May 15	1.43 1/2	1.52 1/2
May 16	1.45 1/2	1.55 1/2
May 17	1.45 1/2	1.55 1/2
May 18	1.45 1/2	1.55 1/2
May 19	1.44	1.55 1/2
May 20	1.45 1/2	1.56 1/2
May 21	1.44	1.55 1/2
May 22	1.45 1/2	1.57 1/2
May 23	1.48	1.58 1/2
May 24	1.47 1/2	1.56
May 25	1.46 1/2	1.52 1/2
May 26	1.45 1/2	1.52
May 27	1.43 1/2	1.50 1/2
May 28	1.41 1/2	1.48 1/2
May 29	1.41 1/2	1.50 1/2
May 30	1.43 1/2	1.52
June 1	1.40 1/2	1.46
June 2	1.43 1/2	1.50 1/2
June 3	1.40 1/2	1.48 1/2
June 4	1.39 1/2	1.47 1/2
June 5	1.42 1/2	1.48 1/2
June 6	1.40 1/2	1.46 1/2
June 7	1.38 1/2	1.43 1/2
June 8	1.38 1/2	1.42 1/2
June 9	1.38 1/2	1.40 1/2
June 10	1.37 1/2	1.39
June 11	1.36 1/2	1.38 1/2
June 12	1.35	1.36
June 13	1.35 1/2	1.36 1/2
June 14	1.38	1.40 1/2
June 15	1.37 1/2	1.40 1/2
June 16	1.36 1/2	1.41 1/2
June 17	1.37 1/2	1.41 1/2
June 18	1.36 1/2	1.39 1/2
June 19	1.36 1/2	1.40
June 20	1.35 1/2	1.38 1/2
June 21	1.35 1/2	1.38 1/2
June 22	1.38 1/2	1.38 1/2
June 23	1.35 1/2	1.38 1/2
June 24	1.36 1/2	1.40 1/2
June 25	1.36 1/2	1.40 1/2
June 26	1.36 1/2	1.40 1/2
June 27	1.36 1/2	1.40 1/2
June 28	1.34 1/2	1.39 1/2
June 29	1.34 1/2	1.39
June 30	1.31	1.36 1/2
July 1	1.32 1/2	1.37
July 2	1.30	1.34 1/2
July 3	1.31 1/2	1.34 1/2
July 4	1.30 1/2	1.33 1/2
July 5	1.30 1/2	1.33 1/2
July 6	1.29 1/2	1.31 1/2
July 7	1.29 1/2	1.30 1/2
July 8	1.27 1/2	1.27 1/2
July 9	1.23 1/2	1.26
July 10	1.26 1/2	1.29 1/2
July 11	1.24 1/2	1.26 1/2
July 12	1.24 1/2	1.26 1/2
July 13	1.18 1/2	1.20 1/2
July 14	1.20 1/2	1.23 1/2
July 15	1.19 1/2	1.23 1/2
July 16	1.21 1/2	1.25 1/2
July 17	1.20 1/2	1.25
July 18	1.20 1/2	1.25 1/2
July 19	1.20 1/2	1.25 1/2
July 20	1.17 1/2	1.23 1/2
July 21	1.17 1/2	1.24 1/2
July 22	1.16 1/2	1.23 1/2
July 23	1.16 1/2	1.26 1/2
July 24	1.14 1/2	1.25 1/2
July 25	1.13 1/2	1.24 1/2
July 26	1.18 1/2	1.24 1/2
July 27	1.14 1/2	1.21
July 28	1.11 1/2	1.19 1/2
July 29	1.14 1/2	1.20 1/2
July 30	1.10 1/2	1.16 1/2
July 31	1.10 1/2	1.17 1/2
Aug. 1	1.11	1.17 1/2
Aug. 2	1.14 1/2	1.21 1/2
Aug. 3	1.13	1.18 1/2
Aug. 4	1.12 1/2	1.18 1/2
Aug. 5	1.12 1/2	1.18 1/2
Aug. 6	1.12 1/2	1.18 1/2
Aug. 7	1.12	1.17 1/2
Aug. 8	1.09 1/2	1.15 1/2
Aug. 9	1.08 1/2	1.14 1/2
Aug. 10	1.08 1/2	1.15 1/2
Aug. 11	1.09 1/2	1.15 1/2
Aug. 12	1.13 1/2	1.19 1/2

Comparative prices of No. 1 northern spring wheat at Minneapolis and
Winnipeg, as reported in the Chicago Tribune—Continued

Date	Minneapolis	Winnipeg
1928		
Aug. 25	\$1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	\$1.16
Aug. 26	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Aug. 28	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Aug. 29	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.18
Aug. 30	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17
Aug. 31	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 1	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 2	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 5	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 6	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 7	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.15
Sept. 8	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 9	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 11	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 12	1.09 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 13	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 14	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 15	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 16	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 18	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 19	1.09 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 20	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 21	1.12	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 22	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 23	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 25	1.17	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 26	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 27	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 28	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 29	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Sept. 30	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 2	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 3	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24
Oct. 4	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 5	1.14	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 6	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.27
Oct. 7	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.28
Oct. 9	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.29 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 10	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.26 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 11	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24
Oct. 12	1.13	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 14	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 16	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 17	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 18	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 19	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 20	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 21	1.09 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 23	1.08 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 24	1.09 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 25	1.09	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 26	1.09 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22
Oct. 27	1.09 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 28	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 30	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Oct. 31	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 1	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21
Nov. 2	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 4	1.09 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 5	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 8	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 8	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 10	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 11	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22
Nov. 14	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 15	1.13	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 16	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24
Nov. 17	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 18	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24
Nov. 20	1.13	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 21	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 22	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 23	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 24	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 25	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.18 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 27	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 28	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$
Nov. 29	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.18 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 1	1.12	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 4	1.14	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 5	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 6	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 7	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 8	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 9	1.12	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 11	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 12	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 13	1.12	1.17
Dec. 14	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 15	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.18 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 16	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 18	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 19	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 20	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17
Dec. 21	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 22	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 23	1.11	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 27	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 28	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 29	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Dec. 30	1.08 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
1929		
Jan. 3	1.10	1.17
Jan. 4	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.16
Jan. 5	1.08 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 6	1.08 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 8	1.10	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$

Comparative prices of No. 1 northern spring wheat at Minneapolis and
Winnipeg, as reported in the Chicago Tribune—Continued

Date	Minneapolis	Winnipeg
1929		
Jan. 9	\$1.11	\$1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 10	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.18
Jan. 11	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 12	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.18 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 13	1.16	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 15	1.16	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 16	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.20
Jan. 17	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21
Jan. 18	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 19	1.18 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 20	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 22	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.38
Jan. 23	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 24	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 25	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 26	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.26
Jan. 27	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 29	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 30	1.18	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Jan. 31	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 1	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 2	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 3	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 5	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 6	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 7	1.21	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 8	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 9	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 10	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 12	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 14	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.28 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 15	1.26 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.30 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 16	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.29 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 17	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.29 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 19	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.30 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 20	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.30 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 21	1.26 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.31 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 22	1.26 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.31
Feb. 24	1.26 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.31
Feb. 26	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.28 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 27	1.25	1.29 $\frac{1}{2}$
Feb. 28	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.27
Mar. 1	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.28 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 2	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.28 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 3	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.28 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 5	1.23	1.27 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 6	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 7	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 8	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.26 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 9	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.26 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 10	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.28 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 12	1.23	1.28
Mar. 13	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.30 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 15	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.29 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 16	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.29 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 17	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.29
Mar. 19	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.28 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 20	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.27 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 21	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.27 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 22	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.27 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 23	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 26	1.18 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 27	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mar. 28	1.17	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 2	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 3	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 4	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 5	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 6	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 7	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 9	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 10	1.18 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 11	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 12	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 13	1.18 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.25 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 14	1.20	1.26 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 15	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.26 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 17	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 18	1.17 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.24 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 19	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 20	1.16 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.23 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 21	1.15	1.22 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 23	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 24	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 25	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 26	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 27	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 28	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
Apr. 30	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 1	1.15	1.20 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 2	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21
May 3	1.15 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 4	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.21 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 5	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 8	1.06 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 9	1.08 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 10	1.05 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.10 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 11	1.06 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 12	1.07 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 14	1.07 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.13 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 15	1.08 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.14
May 16	1.08 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.14
May 17	1.07 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 18	1.05	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 19	1.04 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.13
May 21	1.06	1.14 $\frac{1}{2}$
May 22	1.04 $\frac{1}{2}$	1.12 $\frac{1}{2}$

And the situation grows constantly more acute. The wheat-producing countries of the world are recovering from the aftermath of the war. They are introducing American machinery and modern scientific methods, and the world supply of all farm products is growing year by year. The following table shows the steady increase in the world wheat crop:

Wheat yields by principal countries
(In millions of bushels)

	Canada	United States	Argentina	Australia	India	Europe ¹	Total
1929.....					310		
1928.....	534	903	310	159	290	1,381	3,577
1927.....	480	878	239	116	336	1,267	3,316
1926.....	410	831	221	165	325	1,208	3,160
1925.....	411	676	191	113	331	1,390	3,112
1924.....	262	864	191	165	361	1,051	2,894
1923.....	474	797	248	125	372	1,257	3,273
1922.....	400	808	196	109	367	1,044	2,984
1921.....	301	815	191	129	250	1,216	2,902
1920.....	263	833	156	196	378	949	2,725
1919.....	193	968	217	46	280	899	2,603

¹ Exclusive of Russia.

As the world supply of foodstuffs increases the price of American farm products sinks with the world price. While every other class in America is protected by high-tariff walls, the farmer is left outside through failure of Congress to make his tariffs effective. If you refuse to vote on the debenture plan and insist on passing this bill in its present form you will raise the price of the farmer's necessities to the highest level ever paid in time of peace and give him a price for his labor and his products lower in purchasing power than he has ever received since boards of trade were established. This bill as now written proposes the highest of high tariffs for industry and absolute free trade for surplus farm products. Defeat this rule and give us a chance to vote on the debenture plan. If you vote it down the Senate will immediately yield in conference and your objective will have been attained. If, on the other hand, the debenture plan is approved you will have done what you could to redeem the campaign promises you made last fall and to bring the farmer into the protective system he has so long supported for the benefit and profit of industry. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, what the people of the country want in connection with this tariff bill is results, and they are not going to be too critical as to what parliamentary methods are used by the responsible party for arriving at the results. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] in his opening remarks outlined the history of the consideration of tariff bills in the House. An examination of the gentleman's speech will convince anyone that, on the whole, Republican rules for the consideration of tariff bills in the past have been much more liberal than Democratic rules for the same purpose have been. I do not say this as a justification, but it is a fact. Never in the history of Republican tariff legislation, so far as I know—and since I first came here there have been four tariff revisions—I say, never in the history of Republican tariff legislation has there been an attempt to bind the members of the Republican Party to vote for or against any amendment or for or against the bill itself; and yet this is just what happened in the last revision for which our Democratic friends were responsible. I am not finding fault with them for their action, because being in the majority, theirs was the responsibility. They had to answer to the country for it, as we must answer now, and that was the method they then chose to execute the will of the majority.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman says that the Republicans have never adopted any resolution in caucus to bind themselves to vote for or against any amendment.

Mr. TILSON. Not within my knowledge.

Mr. BYRNS. Have they not done that in effect when they bring in this rule which prevents any Member of the House, save a majority of 15 Republican Members of the Ways and Means Committee, from offering an amendment?

Mr. TILSON. No; all that we have done by this resolution is to say that the Committee on Ways and Means, having studied this bill for five months, should have the preference in presenting such amendments as in their judgment this House ought to consider. In view of the fact that there are 10,000 items in this bill, we would be attempting a physical impossibility if every Member in the House should be permitted to move an amendment to every one of these various items, with no restriction

upon them. If we ever hoped to pass the bill and have it anything near what a tariff bill should be, there must be very rigorous restrictions. If even a small portion of the proposed amendments should be agreed to, the bill would probably be such a hodgepodge that it would be an impossible proposition.

The items in this bill are related and interrelated to each other, so that, if we should consider, without restriction, amendment after amendment, passing one and failing to pass another, a crazy quilt would be orderly compared with what the bill would be by the time it was finished. For that reason the party responsible for this legislation has chosen the plan of committing to 15 men who have made a study of this bill the preference of bringing in the amendments that should be first considered.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does not the gentleman draw any distinction between a caucus or a conference action, which is outside the House, and an action which precludes a registration of your votes within the House?

Mr. TILSON. I do not see much difference between not being allowed to bring in any amendment at all and having two-thirds of the House, as was the case in the Sixty-third Congress, pledged to vote against every amendment not introduced by the Ways and Means Committee. What is the difference?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The difference is this, that you have a right to vote, and you deny them the right to vote now.

Mr. TILSON. If a pledge is exacted from Members so that they must vote only one way, what is the difference? In 1913 they had to vote against any amendment brought in by anyone else except a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and to vote for every amendment brought in by members of the Committee on Ways and Means. Was that great liberality?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. There is at least this difference, that our action is being taken here in the House while their action was taken in a caucus held behind closed doors.

Mr. TILSON. My friend from Illinois has suggested a difference decidedly in favor of the Republican method.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. For a question.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW] made the statement that in our history there has never been proposed a tariff bill which carried as high rates as are proposed in this bill. I ask the gentleman if that statement is correct?

Mr. TILSON. I do not believe that it is correct. There are some rates that are higher and some that are lower than in previous Republican bills, but, on the whole, the statement of the gentleman is not accurate.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman state just what tariff bill in the past has been presented to the House and adopted which carried as high rates as this bill?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, several Republican tariff bills have carried rates of duty on many items higher than are carried in this bill.

Mr. BYRNS. I am talking about the average.

Mr. TILSON. I am sure that rates in other bills have been higher. Of course, the rates on many agricultural products have been raised quite considerably in this bill, but I believe that most of the increased rates are justified.

Mr. BYRNS. I am speaking now with reference to rates on industrial matters. Can the gentleman point to any tariff bill which has ever carried average tariff rates as high as the pending bill?

Mr. TILSON. I have not examined this bill and its rates in comparison with all other bills that have been passed, but I repeat that while some of the rates are higher and some lower, on the average the rates in the present bill are lower than in some of our previous tariff bills; in fact, the rates in this bill average lower than in the Payne bill, and I believe lower than the Dingley bill. On the whole, the increases made in this bill on the kind of articles to which the gentleman refers—manufactured articles—have been very slight. The increases in the rates on strictly manufactured articles have been comparatively few and very moderate indeed.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. No; the gentleman will have to excuse me, because I wish to proceed in my own time to say a few words about the bill.

When this bill was first reported there was considerable outcry about it. Some of our newer Members may have become somewhat alarmed, thinking that where there was so much outcry there might be some cause for it. I say from the experience of an older Member that of all the tariff bills that have been introduced into this House since I have been a Member of it, by far the least outcry has been made against this present tariff bill. You younger Members have not heard anything to be compared

with what we heard in 1921 and 1922. We were then changing over from a tariff-for-revenue-only bill, the Underwood Act, to a protective bill, and you should have heard the welkin ring at that time.

I wish that any of you younger Members who are interested in research work would go back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1921 and 1922 and read the speeches made in this House, and then turn to the newspaper files of those days and read the dispatches and the editorials. You will find that what has occurred in regard to this bill is not a circumstance to what went on during the consideration of that bill. I remember that my good friend from Illinois [Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY] held forth vociferously against the burdens that were to be laid upon the backs of the suffering people by that bill. I remember that with his usual accuracy he had figured it out to a nicety that it would lay a burden of \$4,000,000,000 on the backs of the people. That was in 1921. Yet, although according to his calculation the \$4,000,000,000 burden was laid on the backs of the people, they seem to have staggered along with it quite comfortably during the last seven years. It did not crush them, nor did it otherwise meet the predictions of those who were maligning the bill at that time.

Here we have a bill that changes about 15 per cent of the paragraphs, some of them very lightly, but which in the aggregate do not affect more than 10 per cent of the business of this country. You who were here and voted eight years ago for the Fordney-McCumber bill are proud of the fact that you voted for the bill which has helped to bring prosperity to this country. [Applause.] We point back with pride to the time when we were Members of that Congress and voted for the tariff bill that is now the law. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MERRITT). The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TILSON. Not now.

The Fordney-McCumber bill was considered in the House just about eight years ago. There was a great outcry raised against it at the time. The bill became a law, with all of its many widely heralded faults and its alleged burden. In spite of that burden the country prospered. We are now proud of it. Now, owing to changed conditions, we are about to change it. The changes with respect to some of the agricultural items are very material, while in most of the manufacturing items but slight changes are proposed, when they are changed at all. We are soon to vote on this bill. I look forward to a time, perhaps 8 or 10 years hence—I do not know how long it will be before changed conditions will again force another revision—when those of us who vote for this bill now will, with the same pleasure that we now look back to the one almost like it—the Fordney-McCumber bill—look back to this day with pride. Let me say to my friends on this side, especially the younger Members, do not pay too serious attention to the criticism that has been made. Of course, everybody can not be satisfied. Of course, every Member would write a somewhat different bill if he were writing it. Each one could write a perfect bill, in his own estimation, but he would be about the only person who would consider it a perfect bill when he finished it. There can be but a single bill enacted into law, and so we must compromise.

Many important matters will be brought here by amendments, and the amendments will be thrown open to amendment. The conditions will then be different from what they were in 1913, when the Underwood bill was passed. We shall probably have a hundred amendments voted on in Committee of the Whole. The Democrats are entitled to vote upon them, and no one on this side is pledged to vote for or against amendments as the Democrats were pledged in caucus to do in 1913.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman think the question of giving the President the right to raise or lower by 50 per cent the tariff rates is a bigger question than the bill itself, and does he not think that ought to be included in the amendments?

Mr. TILSON. The right to which the gentlemen refers has been exercised by the President since the tariff act of 1922, and it has been a helpful feature of the law. This bill extends it somewhat. I do not know just how far it will be held that this bill extends that privilege. I hope that it does not extend it too far so as to raise any question of its constitutionality, for I

think it a wise provision and which has been used wisely thus far, and probably will be by all succeeding Presidents.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. No; I can not yield now. I have only one more word to say.

I wish every Republican Member to feel that in voting for this rule he is not voting to tie himself or deprive himself of any right or privilege but is voting for a method for the consideration of the bill which a large majority of the Republican Members believe to be the best method of considering it. Having arrived at a conclusion as to what is the best method, I hope that it will be adopted, and that we shall not take too seriously the furore that we hear from our friends on the Democratic side—a furore which they have always made when they have no responsibility. Ours is the responsibility. We are shouldering that responsibility, and shall carry it in the manner that seems best to us. We believe that this rule is the best method by which to proceed to the further consideration and final disposition of this bill. [Applause and cries of "vote!"]

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, before I proceed to a discussion of some of the features of the bill involved here, I think it important that you should have a full understanding of exactly what the provisions of this rule mean when we adopt it.

The Committee on Rules, of course, has extraordinary power. It is in effect the political and policy committee of the House of Representatives. They are bringing in here a special rule to-day to abrogate all the regular rules of the House and substitute in place of the regular rules of the House for the orderly consideration of this bill an extraordinarily autocratic and repressive rule. I say "extraordinarily autocratic and repressive" advisedly, because I have made some examination of the former rules that have been brought into the House for consideration of tariff bills, and I assert here that neither the chairman of this committee nor any other man familiar with the precedents can successfully controvert the statement that this is the most ironclad and restrictive rule ever reported to the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

It is the first time in the history of our parliamentary procedure when any Committee on Rules has had the audacity to bring in a rule which absolutely denies the right of any Member of the House upon any schedule in the bill, except members of the Ways and Means Committee, to offer any amendment to the bill from beginning to end. They have substituted by this rule and by the action of the Republican caucus the autocratic judgment of 15 members of the Committee on Ways and Means for the collective wisdom and judgment of the House of Representatives, including the rights of the minority.

Now, reference has been made to the rule that has been brought in when we passed the Underwood tariff bill, but that rule did not prevent the offering of amendments to any of the schedules of the proposed bill. It threw the question wide open when it came to the respective schedules, except that it prohibited the offering of amendments to change an article from the free list to the dutiable list, or vice versa.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. For a brief question; yes.

Mr. SNELL. What about the Underwood rule with reference to germaneness?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is exactly what I am referring to, and it effectuated the very thing I have just suggested, that of prohibiting the offering of amendments to change an article from the free list to the dutiable list, or vice versa. The gentleman from New York knows that.

Mr. SNELL. It made it almost prohibitory for a Member of the House to offer any kind of an amendment in the consideration of the bill. The gentleman well knows it and every Member on that side well knows it, and that was the reason it was adopted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I realize there is party responsibility to some extent in passing measures of this sort, but I assert that the majority party has not the moral legislative right to take away from the minority all rights to interpose its views at any stage of the legislative proceeding, and that is exactly what this rule does. In the consideration of the Underwood bill, as I have just been reminded by my friend from Georgia, to show how liberal it was in its provision for amendments, one Representative from the State of Illinois, the distinguished Mr. Mann, offered 110 amendments to that bill.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman give me an additional five minutes?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; if it is necessary.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, I will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. SNELL. The reason they allowed the gentleman from Illinois to offer those amendments was because you had an iron-bound rule in your caucus that the Democratic Members would vote against every amendment that anybody offered. That understanding was so ironclad that you gentlemen did not even take the opportunity of making points of order and many of the amendments offered were subject to points of order. You did not make those points of order because you had your men bound and hog tied, and the gentleman well knows that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I was not a Member of Congress at that time.

Mr. SNELL. I accept the gentleman's apology, then.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am assuming that the gentleman from New York is stating the facts correctly, but that does not change in the least the principle I am seeking to present in this case. The facts are that under the Underwood rule the bill was thrown open for amendments, and I now ask the gentleman from New York this direct question.

Mr. SNELL. I will answer it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And I am sure that with his candor and honesty he will answer it in the affirmative—if it is not the purpose, effect, and intent of this rule to prevent absolutely the offering of any amendment touching any subject in this bill except amendments proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SNELL. No, sir. I will answer with candor that that is not the effect.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, I will show you what will be the effect of it.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman asked me to answer his question and I did.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make this prophecy, and I am backed in the prophecy by what took place when we passed the Fordney-McCumber bill in 1922. I happened to be here at that time and know something about it. You brought in a rule which did allow some amendments to certain schedules in your bill about which there was some dissatisfaction on the Republican side. You were that generous at that time. Now you are not even that generous, but under this rule you limit it to amendments proposed by the committee. What happened? I have the record here of what happened under the rule you then adopted.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman is talking about a prophecy. The gentleman asked me a question which I answered, but I can not prophesy what will happen.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the Republicans are pretty good in carrying out their nefarious precedents.

Here is what happened at that time: They came in and said, "This is a fairly liberal rule," and as the gentleman from New York just said a moment ago with reference to this rule, it provides for the orderly consideration of this bill. God save the mark! If this rule which you have brought in offers a possibility of an orderly consideration of this bill, then I would like to know how you could ever get disorderly procedure.

Mr. SNELL. Is not that a true statement, that it provides for the orderly consideration of the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am loath to concede that the gentleman can make any statement with reference to the tariff proposition and the rules and carry them into effect that would be orderly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It has been stated that under the Underwood rule we were pledged to vote against all amendments, but amendments were allowed to be offered by the Republican side or by anybody and they were given a chance to express their views upon those amendments by a vote, were they not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Which we have not under this rule.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We have no opportunity here at all. The effect of this rule is that you will not have any opportunity to offer amendments, and you will see that my statement is true. The committee has 110 amendments to offer, and if it took 20 minutes for each amendment, it would take 36 hours to dispose of the committee amendments, and that will take us long past 3 o'clock post meridian on Tuesday next, when we are to vote on this bill.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, the gentleman—

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

I want to make some serious comment, if I may, with reference to one provision of this rule, but before I come to that, I saw a statement in this morning's Post, which was given out by the distinguished Republican leader on the new principle of

voices here in the House. He refers to the voice of the caucus that the distinguished members of the majority party held last night:

The voice of the caucus was that the Ways and Means Committee—

That is, 15 men in the House of Representatives, and 15 men only, out of a total representation of 435—

is representative of the Congress and the country as a whole and that after five months of consideration of the bill its members were to be trusted to offer amendments rather than throw the entire affair open to every Tom, Dick, and Harry.

[Laughter.]

Now, I do not happen to be Tom, Dick, or Harry, but I am standing here and I assert this as solemnly, and as earnestly as I can speak it, undertaking to represent more than 200,000 people down in Alabama, just as you are here as the Representatives of other constituencies of that sort. I know from an examination of this bill that its provisions are against the interests of my agricultural district all the way along the line [applause], and under our theory of government, under an orderly consideration of this bill, if we had an opportunity to secure it, I as a Representative of that constituency, would be entitled, under the Constitution and under the orderly rules of the House, to stand in my place here and seek to perfect this bill by some amendments that I conceive in my judgment to be beneficial to my people; and there are others here who feel the same way.

I have heard vigorous attacks made upon the provisions of this bill by a number of men on the Republican side and yet under this new principle of government, of autocracy and centralization, the voice of 15 men—the Ways and Means Committee—has become the mandate of the Representatives of all of the people of America sent here to represent them.

Gentlemen, before I conclude there is just one other subject I want to touch on. I regard it as a matter of the most profound importance, more important than any question that has come before the Congress of the United States since my service here began. I refer to the provisions in this bill delegating to the President of the United States the practical right to lay and levy taxes upon the people of America. This is no small matter, my friends, this is no trifling thing, and the consideration of these very propositions makes this session to-day a momentous one in my opinion in the history of the Government of the United States.

If there is any one thing that the founders of this Republic had in mind, it was to establish a form of government with independent branches, and if you will read the Constitution, wherever the question is suggested, you will find that thought carried into effect.

Section 1 of the first article of the Constitution:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Section 7:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

Section 8:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

Nowhere within the four corners of this document can you find even by a strained construction or intimation that those who framed this document ever had it in contemplation that the representatives of the people should surrender these sovereign powers to the Executive. On the contrary, it is made plain when you come to the provisions of the Constitution affecting the Executive that the only contact he can properly have with the Congress of the United States and the law-making power is that he may make such recommendations to the Congress of the United States as in his opinion will best conserve the interests of the people.

What is the use of having a representative body to lay taxes and originate bills raising revenue as provided in the Constitution if we surrender such power to the President of the United States?

I want to say one thing here in this connection with reference to my friend, Brother CROWTHER, of New York. A few days ago, when he was discussing this bill, it occurred to me that although he seemed to be very much dissatisfied with some of the provisions of the bill, he did not attack it with that ferocity that he sometimes exhibits when he gets up here to discuss what he regards as defects in the tariff bill. I thought there was some reason for this, and I waited until almost the conclusion of his argument when some gentleman interrupted him. Mr. BURNETT said:

Will the gentleman tell us what relief he believes will be obtained in the administration of the flexible provisions of the act? Will it be

necessary to wait two or three years before the preliminary report can be made?

And here is Mr. CROWTHER's answer, and here, my friends, in my opinion, is the way in which it is anticipated that all those who are clamoring for additional and higher rates will effectuate their purpose:

Mr. CROWTHER. I have no authority, of course, to speak for the President, but I think that it is the President's hope and desire that the Tariff Commission may be so constituted and speeded up and with this new method of not depending on obtaining foreign valuation but arbitrarily using the United States value that we shall be able to get 60-to-90-day decisions in matters of this kind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MERRITT). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What does that mean, gentlemen of the House? As I have undertaken to assert, in my opinion, the constitutional method of levying taxes is for the Congress of the United States to exercise its given function to do it and to use its judgment after an investigation of all the facts to determine as the representatives of the people whether or not a certain item should have higher duties or whether an existing duty should be lowered.

That, it seems to me, is the ideal and constitutional method of levying tariff taxes. But as soon as this flexible provision in this bill goes into effect, if it should stand the test of the Supreme Court of the United States, all that these gentlemen would have to do, these men who are clamoring for high rates on all articles they have expressed dissatisfaction with in the schedules, would be to go before the Tariff Commission and have an ex parte proceeding, present their testimony to a biased commission, composed, if the President desires them to be so composed, of seven men, who believe in a high protective-tariff system, and practically behind closed doors secure a recommendation from this favorable commission for the imposition of additional duties. Thereby, people who have to bear the burden would be deprived of taking part in the consideration of the necessity for this proposition.

Gentlemen, the orderly way for the consideration of this bill, under the rules of the House and as a matter of fairness and merit, would be to give the Members on this side and those on the majority side of the House who, if they had an opportunity to offer an amendment and could show good reasons why they should be adopted—the orderly thing to do is to vote down the previous question. If that is done, it would give us an opportunity, because I am sure my friend from North Carolina would offer an amendment providing that the bill should be considered under the regular rules of the House. Give us an opportunity to amend this bill in those sections which many of us believe are burdensome, unwise, and unsound. [Applause.] I hope that will be done.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE].

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, this is not the opportunity to engage in an adequate discussion of the remarks in regard to the flexible tariff made by the gentleman who has just taken his seat. But within the three minutes I hope to be able to point out one phase of the situation that deserves the attention and reflection of the Democratic Party, not only in the House but in the Nation.

I find that in the Democratic platform of 1928—the latest Democratic platform—it was said that Democratic tariff legislation would be based on policies, of which this was one:

Abolition of logrolling and restoration of the Wilson conception of a fact-finding tariff committee, quasi-judicial.

Let any man on the Democratic side rise and tell me what "quasi-judicial" means if it does not mean delegation of power. Let any man who spoke against the flexible tariff provision in 1922 now rise and tell me the day on which he spoke, or if that can not be recalled, tell me at least that he did protest. None made protest then; but now, ignoring the platform commitment, the pledge of the party to delegation of tariff power, they take the floor to remonstrate against such delegation.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I can not; I have not the time. I would, however, be very glad to yield if the gentleman spoke against delegation in 1922.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts rose.

Mr. LUCE. Oh, the gentleman from Massachusetts was not in the House in 1922.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. I just want to say that that was because of the overcrowded condition of the courts, and that is one of the fundamental policies of Massachusetts, and

a proper policy of both parties. The policy of a quasi-judicial body and the policy underlying their existence is entirely different from the matter under consideration in this bill.

Mr. LUCE. Like my friend, I adhere to the Massachusetts interpretation of the State and National Constitution. We have seen nothing unconstitutional in giving our railroad and public service commissions, together with other administrative agencies, the power to carry out the legislative will, the power of applying to details a general principle laid down in the law. It was not, however, my purpose to discuss the broad issue at this time. I have risen only to point out the inconsistency of a party that seeks and promises to delegate power and then comes here and repudiates the pledge upon which it has fought the battle. [Applause.]

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly well aware that nothing any Democrat can say is going to interfere with the swift progress of the steam roller which has been so well oiled in two or three conferences that have been held by the Republican Members of the House. I asked for this time particularly for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the very remarkable interview of the Republican leader, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], as published in this morning's Washington Post. It has already been referred to and read by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], but it is so remarkable that I am going to ask the indulgence of the Members of the House that I may read it again for their particular information if they have not already read it.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman say that it is an interview?

Mr. BYRNS. It purports to be a quoted interview with the gentleman from Connecticut, who speaks, of course, for his party. It reads as follows:

"The voice of the caucus," said Representative TILSON, of Connecticut, the Republican leader, after the second session was over, "was that the Ways and Means Committee is representative of the Congress and the country as a whole, and that after five months of consideration of the bill its members were to be trusted to offer amendments rather than throw the entire affair open to every Tom, Dick, and Harry."

Now, who are Tom, Dick, and Harry?

Mr. TILSON. All of us.

Mr. BYRNS. Those familiar names refer to every Member of this House, on both the Democratic and Republican sides, except 15 Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means, if you adopt this rule. I particularly ask my Republican friends if they are by their vote for the adoption of this rule going to hog tie themselves and then go back to a proud constituency which sent them here not only to voice their views but represent them in the consideration of important measures in this House and tell them that by the adoption of this rule and that by voting for this rule they turned over to a majority of 15 Republican Members of this House, nearly all of whom, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] pointed out the other day, come from a section of the country east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio, the sole privilege of offering amendments in framing this great tariff bill, which so vitally affects all interests of the country and particularly the agricultural interests?

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. CROWTHER. The gentleman would not be afraid, would he, individually to trust any of those 15 on any important matter?

Mr. BYRNS. Oh, no; on anything affecting a personal matter, but I would be very much afraid to trust them on any matter of politics relating to the tariff. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. CROWTHER. I say to the gentleman that every man on that committee tried to live his political life just like his personal life. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNS. I do not question the personal sincerity or the integrity of the gentleman from New York or any other member of that committee, but I have serious doubt when it comes to their collective action on a tariff bill. I do say that as representatives of the constituencies which sent you gentlemen here to represent them, and not seven or eight Republican Members from a few States in one section of the country, it is your duty and mine to give fair consideration to this bill, and certainly it is our constitutional right and privilege to have the opportunity if we desire it of offering amendments. Your vote on this rule will indicate whether you are willing to courageously represent the views of your constituents or hide behind the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I have reserved a little time for myself in closing this debate, but I do not see that I need it. Thus far, the Members of the minority have made practically no opposition to the rule as presented, and as a matter of fact, I think most of them in their own hearts are in favor of it. [Applause and laughter.] I have never noticed my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], when he was as tame as he is to-day. He said that he could not fully discuss the rule in five minutes. As a matter of fact, he wasted the time that he took to discuss the rule, because he said he was trying to inform Republicans as to what it meant. I assure the gentleman that every man on this side of the House knew what the rule meant when it was presented here to-day.

There is only one practical question before us and that is as to whether we will go along and consider this bill and vote on it. It so happens that the American people commissioned the Republican Party by an enormous vote to rewrite the tariff law. They did it because they believed in our principles and record in tariff legislation, and as far as I am concerned, I am willing to take that responsibility now. [Applause on Republican side.] This is the reason that I now move the previous question on this resolution and ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves the previous question.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, we are perfectly willing that they shall have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 138, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]
YEAS—243

Ackerman	Dowell	Kaynor	Rowbottom
Adkins	Dunbar	Kearns	Sanders, N. Y.
Aldrich	Dyer	Kelly	Schafer, Wis.
Allen	Eaton, N. J.	Kemp	Sears
Andresen	Elliot	Kendall, Ky.	Seger
Andrew	Ellis	Ketcham	Seiberling
Arentz	Englebright	Kiefner	Selvig
Aswell	Estep	Kiess	Shaffer, Va.
Bacharach	Esterly	Knutson	Short, Mo.
Bachmann	Evans, Calif.	Kopp	Shott, W. Va.
Bacon	Fenn	Korell	Shreve
Baird	Fish	Kurtz	Simmons
Barbour	Fort	Lantz	Simms
Beck	Foss	Lankford, Va.	Slack
Beedy	Free	Lea, Calif.	Sloan
Beers	Freeman	Leavitt	Smith, Idaho
Blackburn	French	Leech	Snell
Bohn	Garber, Okla.	Lehlbach	Snow
Bolton	Garber, Va.	Letts	Speaks
Bowman	Gibson	Luce	Spearing
Brand, Ohio	Gifford	McClintock, Ohio	Sproul, Ill.
Brigham	Glynn	McCormick, Ill.	Stalker
Britten	Goodwin	McLaughlin	Stobbs
Brumm	Graham	Maas	Stone
Buckbee	Guy	Magrady	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Hadley	Manlove	Strong, Pa.
Burtness	Hale	Mapes	Sullivan, Pa.
Butler	Hall, Ill.	Martin	Summers, Wash.
Cable	Hall, Ind.	Menges	Swanson
Campbell, Iowa	Hall, N. Dak.	Merritt	Swick
Campbell, Pa.	Halsey	Michaelson	Swing
Carter, Calif.	Hancock	Michener	Taber
Carter, Wyo.	Hardy	Miller	Taylor, Tenn.
Chalmers	Hartley	Moore, Ohio	Temple
Chase	Haugen	Morgan	Thatcher
Chindblom	Hawley	Mouser	Thompson
Christgau	Hess	Murphy	Thurston
Christopherson	Hickey	Nelson, Me.	Tilson
Clague	Hoch	Nelson, Wis.	Timberlake
Clancy	Hoffman	Newhall	Tinkham
Clark, Md.	Hogg	Niedringhaus	Treadway
Clarke, N. Y.	Holiday	O'Connor, La.	Underhill
Cochran, Pa.	Hooper	O'Connor, Okla.	Vestal
Cole	Hope	Palmer	Vincent, Mich.
Colton	Hopkins	Parker	Wainwright
Connolly	Houston	Perkins	Walker
Cooke	Hudson	Pittenger	Wason
Cooper, Ohio	Hughes	Porter	Watres
Coyle	Hull, Morton D.	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Watson
Craddock	Hull, William E.	Pratt, Ruth	Welsh, Pa.
Craik	Irwin	Pritchard	Whitley
Cramton	James	Purnell	Wigglesworth
Crowther	Jenkins	Ramey, Frank M.	Williams, Ill.
Culkin	Johnson, Ill.	Ramseyer	Williamson
Dallinger	Johnson, Ind.	Ransley	Wolfenden
Darrow	Johnson, Nebr.	Reece	Wolverton, N. J.
Davenport	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reid, N. Y.	Wolverton, W. Va.
Dempsey	Johnson, Wash.	Reid, Ill.	Woodruff
Denison	Johnston, Mo.	Robinson, Iowa	Wyant
De Priest	Jonas, N. C.	Robison, Ky.	Yates
DeRouen	Kading	Rogers	Zihlman
Dickinson	Kahn		

NAYS—138

Abernethy	Ayres	Box	Browning
Algood	Bankhead	Boylan	Brunner
Almon	Black	Brand, Ga.	Buchanan
Arnold	Bland	Briggs	Busby
Auf der Heide	Bloom	Browne	Byrns

Canfield	Garner, Tex.	Lee, Tex.	Ragon
Cannon	Garrett	Linthicum	Rainey, Henry T.
Cartwright	Gasque	Lozier	Rankin
Clark, N. C.	Glover	Ludlow	Rayburn
Cochran, Mo.	Goldsborough	McCloskey	Romjue
Collier	Green	McCormack, Mass.	Rutherford
Collins	Greenwood	McDuffie	Sanders, Tex.
Connerly	Gregory	McKeown	Sandlin
Cooper, Tenn.	Hall, Miss.	McMillan	Schneider
Cooper, Wis.	Hammer	McReynolds	Smith, W. Va.
Cox	Hare	McSwain	Sproul, Kans.
Crisp	Hastings	Mansfield	Stafford
Cross	Hill, Ala.	Milligan	Stegall
Crosser	Hill, Wash.	Montague	Steele
Davis	Howard	Mooney	Summers, Tex.
Dominick	Huddleston	Morehead	Tarver
Doughton	Hudspeth	Nelson, Mo.	Tucker
Douglas, Ariz.	Hull, Tenn.	Norton	Underwood
Doxey	Hull, Wis.	O'Connell, R. I.	Vinson, Ga.
Drane	Jeffers	Oldfield	Warren
Drewry	Johnson, Okla.	Oliver, Ala.	Whitehead
Driver	Johnson, Tex.	Oliver, N. Y.	Whittington
Edwards	Jones, Tex.	Owen	Williams, Tex.
Eslick	Kerr	Palmisano	Wilson
Evans, Mont.	Kincheloe	Parks	Wingo
Fisher	Kvale	Patman	Woodrum
Fitzpatrick	LaGuardia	Patterson	Wright
Fuller	Lambertson	Pou	Yon
Fulmer	Lampert	Quayle	
Gambrill	Lankford, Ga.	Quin	

NOT VOTING—40

Bell	Doyle	Lanham	O'Connor, N. Y.
Carew	Eaton, Colo.	Larsen	Prall
Carley	Fitzgerald	Lindsay	Sabath
Celler	Frear	McClintic, Okla.	Sirovich
Corning	Golder	McFadden	Somers, N. Y.
Cullen	Griest	McLeod	Stedman
Curry	Griffin	Mead	Stevenson
Dickstein	Igoe	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Colo.
Douglass, Mass.	Kendall, Pa.	Newton	Welch, Calif.
Doutrich	Kunz	O'Connell, N. Y.	Wood

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Golder (for) with Mr. O'Connell of New York (against).
 Mr. Griest (for) with Mr. Corning (against).
 Mr. McLeod (for) with Mr. Carew (against).
 Mr. Welch of California (for) with Mr. Igoe (against).
 Mr. Curry (for) with Mr. Larsen (against).
 Mr. McFadden (for) with Mr. Dickstein (against).
 Mr. Wood (for) with Mr. Bell (against).
 Mr. Eaton of Colorado (for) with Mr. Sirovich (against).
 Mr. Doutrich (for) with Mr. Carley (against).
 Mr. Kendall of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. McClintic of Oklahoma (against).
 Mr. Fitzgerald (for) with Mr. Lindsay (against).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. LARSEN, is ill. If he were able to be present and were here to-day, he would vote "no."

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the rule.

Mr. POUL. I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. SNELL. I have no objection to that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 138, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]
YEAS—234

Ackerman	Clancy	Free	Irwin
Adkins	Clark, Md.	Freeman	James
Aldrich	Clarke, N. Y.	French	Jenkins
Allen	Cochran, Pa.	Garber, Okla.	Johnson, Ill.
Andresen	Cole	Garber, Va.	Johnson, Ind.
Andrew	Colton	Gibson	Johnson, Nebr.
Arentz	Connolly	Gifford	Johnson, S. Dak.
Aswell	Cooper, Ohio	Glynn	Johnson, Wash.
Bacharach	Coyle	Goodwin	Johnston, Mo.
Bachmann	Craddock	Graham	Jonas, N. C.
Bacon	Craik	Guy	Kading
Baird	Cramton	Hadley	Kahn
Barbour	Culkin	Hale	Kaynor
Beers	Dallinger	Hall, Ill.	Kearns
Blackburn	Darrow	Hall, Ind.	Kelly
Bohn	Davenport	Hall, N. Dak.	Kemp
Bolton	Dempsey	Halsey	Kendall, Ky.
Bowman	Denison	Hancock	Ketcham
Brand, Ohio	De Priest	Hardy	Kiefner
Brigham	DeRouen	Hartley	Kiess
Britten	Dickinson	Haugen	Knutson
Brumm	Dowell	Hawley	Kopp
Buckbee	Dunbar	Hess	Korell
Burdick	Dyer	Hickey	Kurtz
Burtness	Eaton, N. J.	Hoch	Langley
Butler	Elliott	Hogg	Lankford, Va.
Cable	Ellis	Holiday	Leatherwood
Campbell, Pa.	Englebright	Hooper	Leavitt
Carter, Calif.	Estep	Hope	Lehlbach
Carter, Wyo.	Esterly	Hopkins	Letts
Chalmers	Evans, Calif.	Houston	Luce
Chase	Fenn	Hudson	McClintock, Ohio
Chindblom	Fish	Hughes	McCormick, Ill.
Christgau	Fort	Hull, Morton D.	McLaughlin
Clague	Foss	Hull, William E.	

Maas	Ramey, Frank M.	Smith, Idaho	Tinkham
Magrady	Ramseyer	Snell	Treadway
Manlove	Ransley	Sparks	Underhill
Mapes	Reece	Speaks	Vestal
Martin	Reed, N. Y.	Sparring	Vincent, Mich.
Menges	Reid, Ill.	Sproul, Ill.	Wainwright
Merritt	Robinson, Iowa	Stalker	Walker
Michener	Robson, Ky.	Stobbs	Wason
Miller	Rogers	Stone	Watres
Moore, Ohio	Rowbottom	Strong, Kans.	Watson
Morgan	Sanders, N. Y.	Strong, Pa.	Welsh, Pa.
Mouser	Schafer, Wis.	Sullivan, Pa.	Whitley
Murphy	Sears	Summers, Wash.	Wigglesworth
Niedringhaus	Seger	Swanson	Williams, Ill.
O'Connor, La.	Seiberling	Swick	Williamson
O'Connor, Okla.	Selvig	Swing	Wolfenden
Palmer	Shaffer, Va.	Taber	Wolverton, N. J.
Parker	Short, Mo.	Taylor, Tenn.	Wolverton, W. Va.
Perkins	Shott, W. Va.	Temple	Woodruff
Porter	Shreve	Thatcher	Wyant
Pratt, Harcourt J.	Simmons	Thompson	Yates
Pratt, Ruth	Simms	Thurston	Zihlman
Pritchard	Sinclair	Tilson	
Purnell	Sloan	Timberlake	

NAYS—138

Abernethy	Davis	Jeffers	Patman
Allgood	Dominick	Johnson, Okla.	Patterson
Almon	Doughton	Johnson, Tex.	Pou
Arnold	Douglas, Ariz.	Jones, Tex.	Quayle
Auf der Heide	Doxey	Kerr	Quin
Ayres	Drane	Kincheloe	Ragon
Bankhead	Drewry	Kvale	Rainey, Henry T.
Black	Driver	LaGuardia	Rankin
Bland	Edwards	Lambertson	Rayburn
Bloom	Eslick	Lampert	Romjue
Box	Evans, Mont.	Lankford, Ga.	Rutherford
Boylan	Fisher	Lee, Tex.	Sanders, Tex.
Brand, Ga.	Fitzpatrick	Linthicum	Sandlin
Briggs	Fuller	Lozler	Schneider
Brown	Fulmer	Ludlow	Smith, W. Va.
Browning	Gambrill	McCloskey	Sproul, Kans.
Brunner	Garner	McCormack, Mass.	Stafford
Buchanan	Garrett	McDuffie	Stegall
Busby	Gasque	McKeown	Steele
Byrns	Glover	McReynolds	Sumners, Tex.
Campbell, Iowa	Goldsborough	McSwain	Tarver
Canfield	Green	Mansfield	Tucker
Cannon	Greenwood	Milligan	Underwood
Cartwright	Gregory	Montague	Vinson, Ga.
Christopherson	Hall, Miss.	Morehead	Warren
Clark, N. C.	Hammer	Nelson, Mo.	Whitehead
Cochran, Mo.	Hare	Nelson, Wis.	Whittington
Collier	Hastings	Norton	Williams, Tex.
Collins	Hill, Ala.	O'Connell, R. I.	Wilson
Connelly	Hill, Wash.	Oldfield	Wingo
Cooper, Tenn.	Howard	Oliver, Ala.	Woodrum
Cooper, Wis.	Huddleston	Oliver, N. Y.	Wright
Crisp	Hudspeth	Owen	Yon
Cross	Hull, Tenn.	Palmisano	
Crosser	Hull, Wis.	Parks	

NOT VOTING—54

Beck	Doutrich	Lea, Calif.	O'Connor, N. Y.
Beedy	Doyle	Lindsay	Pittenger
Bell	Eaton, Colo.	McClintic, Okla.	Prall
Carew	Fitzgerald	McFadden	Sabath
Carley	Frear	McLeod	Sirovich
Celler	Gold	McMillan	Snow
Cooke	Griest	Mead	Somers, N. Y.
Corning	Griffin	Michaelson	Stedman
Cox	Hoffman	Mooney	Stevenson
Crowther	Igoe	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Colo.
Cullen	Kendall, Pa.	Nelson, Me.	Welch, Calif.
Curry	Kunz	Newball	Wood
Dickstein	Lanham	Newton	
Douglass, Mass.	Larsen	O'Connell, N. Y.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Golder (for) with Mr. O'Connell of New York (against).
 Mr. Griest (for) with Mr. Corning (against).
 Mr. McLeod (for) with Mr. Carew (against).
 Mr. Welch of California (for) with Mr. Igoe (against).
 Mr. Curry (for) with Mr. Larsen (against).
 Mr. McFadden (for) with Mr. Dickstein (against).
 Mr. Wood (for) with Mr. Bell (against).
 Mr. Eaton of Colorado (for) with Mr. Sirovich (against).
 Mr. Doutrich (for) with Mr. Carley (against).
 Mr. Kendall of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. McClintic of Oklahoma (against).
 Mr. Fitzgerald (for) with Mr. Lindsay (against).
 Mr. Crowther (for) with Mr. Cullen (against).
 Mr. Hoffman (for) with Mr. Griffin (against).
 Mr. Michaelson (for) with Mr. Cox (against).
 Mr. Beedy (for) with Mr. McMillan (against).
 Mr. Snow (for) with Mr. O'Connell of New York (against).
 Mr. Nelson of Maine (for) with Mr. Prall (against).
 Mr. Pittenger (for) with Mr. Somers of New York (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Beck with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Cooke with Mr. Sabath.
 Mr. Frear with Mr. Doyle.
 Mr. Newhall with Mr. Mead.

Mr. NEWHALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. NEWHALL. I was not.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. COX. I was not actually in the Chamber; but if I had been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. MICHAELSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. MICHAELSON. No; I was in the lobby.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ENGROSSMENT OF THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossing of the bill H. R. 2667 the Clerk be authorized to make necessary corrections in the section, subsection, paragraph, and subparagraph numbers and letters, and references thereto, and to correct any typographical errors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I understand, this is the usual practice in the consideration of tariff bills?

Mr. HAWLEY. It is.

Mr. GARNER. I have no objection to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE TARIFF

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. SNELL, will kindly take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 2667 under the 5-minute rule. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1. That on and after the day following the passage of this act, except as otherwise specially provided for in this act, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila) the rates of duty which are prescribed by the schedules and paragraphs of the dutiable list of this title, namely:

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire whether at this time I may move to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the last word.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. We might as well have the information at this time. Under the rule is it permissible for any Member to move to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, if anyone objects, gentlemen will have to confine themselves to remarks about the last word.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. May I ask this: The gentleman from Illinois has moved to strike out the last word. Is that a committee amendment?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It is a pro forma amendment.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If that is permissible, then it is permissible for any Member of the House to move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. It is permissible for any Member of the House to make that request and it is permissible for any Member to object if he wants to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the request is out of order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, a unanimous-consent request is always in order. The Chair does not see that such a request contravenes the purpose and intent of the rule, but any gentleman has the right to object to the unanimous-consent request if he so desires.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that I did not take any time in general debate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I merely wanted to get the Chair to pass on the point of order. I shall not object.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I submit that inasmuch as the committee did not ask for recognition and the gentleman from Illinois did, it is perfectly in order under the rule to recognize the gentleman from Illinois. If some one were to present a

committee amendment, under the rule, of course he would have preference.

The CHAIRMAN. In that event the Chair would recognize the gentleman of the committee who had an amendment to present.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Has the first section been read?

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, this is the first paragraph; and I think the reading of the bill should be by paragraphs.

Mr. HASTINGS. I was just wondering whether we were proceeding to read the bill by sections or by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the usual practice that bills of this character are read by paragraphs. I appreciate the fact that the committee can decide whichever way it desires, but unless the committee makes some different recommendation, the present occupant of the chair will consider that the bill should be read by paragraphs, as the Chair believes that tends to more orderly procedure.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] to proceed for 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, when the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means last December determined to undertake the matter of readjustment of the tariff, I took the position that this readjustment should be along conservative lines and that, aside from such increases in agricultural products as good judgment would indicate as likely to be of real and direct benefit to agricultural producers, changes in the present tariff law should be limited practically to cases of real emergency, where new conditions since the enactment of the law of 1922 had shown the necessity for revision of rates or of administrative provisions. Of course, there was diversity of opinion among the 15 members who wrote the pending tariff bill. Some differed from my viewpoint and rather favored a more or less complete revision of the entire law, but in the end the 15 members agreed upon a proposal which fairly represented what I would call a composite rather than a compromise conclusion.

I have no serious fault to find with the proposals in the agricultural schedules of the bill. If they will tend to increase the cost of living to consumers, it is plain that the level of prices and of income to the farmer can not be raised without a corresponding increase in the cost of consumption of the farmer's products. If the agricultural producer is to get assistance from the tariff it can be only through the increase and stabilization of the returns of his investment and labor. If he is to get higher returns, some one must pay those returns and, of course, the "some one" is the consumer. On the other hand, the farmer purchases a variety of articles which are manufactured in mills and factories whose capital and labor enjoy the benefits of the protective tariff. The benefits and burdens of the protective tariff system therefore are and should be mutual as between producers and consumers of all kinds. In the pending bill there are a considerable number of rather large increases in the duties on agricultural products, but I believe them generally justified for the reasons I have indicated.

There is no gainsaying that this special session and the proposed readjustment of the tariff were both due to and caused by the agricultural situation. Agriculture, therefore, deserved the first consideration in the matter of tariff legislation. In other schedules I think the pending bill goes somewhat beyond action that might be deemed absolutely necessary in the adjustment of rates, but very few, if any, of the proposed rates are inordinately or unjustifiably high. The bill is, after all, a protective-tariff measure and if it errs at all the error is on the side of protection. [Applause.] In the matter of production, both manufacturing and agricultural, and with reference both to raw materials and to finished articles we more nearly resemble the Continent of Europe than any single country in Europe. Conditions of competition vary at different points. Our seaboard has advantages in the matter of transportation from abroad and at the same time disadvantages in the matter of competition with importations from abroad. Our inland States suffer by reason of lack of waterway communication with the sea, and it is timely to warn the seaboard States that unless the inland territory is afforded the opportunities for sea communication, which may easily be provided by the St. Lawrence and Mississippi waterways [applause], the time will come when our protective-tariff system will be seriously influenced and affected by these transportation conditions. So-called natural advantages must include possible improvements and ameliorations of natural adverse conditions elsewhere. We are one entire country and our economic advantages and disadvantages should be adjusted equitably, if not equally, so far as may be possible.

Upon my request the United States Tariff Commission prepared tables showing the comparison of the equivalent ad valorem rates of the pending bill—H. R. 2667—with those of the tariff act of 1922. The chairman of the commission makes the following statement in his letter transmitting these tables to me:

The work has been carefully done by our experts, but the tables have not been approved by the commission and are, therefore, tentative and unofficial and subject to revision.

However, I am confident that these figures are substantially correct, and I wish to insert them in the Record for the information which they give. It will be found that on manufactured products the average equivalent ad valorem rates in the pending bill are 38.63 per cent as against 34.78 per cent in the tariff act of 1922; that on agricultural products the average equivalent ad valorem rates in the pending bill are 54.17 per cent as against 40.31 per cent in the tariff act of 1922, and that in the tobacco and alcohol schedules the average equivalent ad valorem rates in the pending bill are 62.68 per cent, as against 62.51 per cent in the tariff act of 1922. The tables which I insert show corresponding comparisons in all of the various schedules of the pending bill and of the tariff act of 1922.

I also append a table showing the average rates of duty under prior tariff laws beginning with the McKinley law of 1890 and including the Wilson law of 1894, the Dingley law of 1897, the Payne-Aldrich law of 1909, the Underwood law of 1913, and the Fordney-McCumber law of 1922. This latter table shows the following average equivalent ad valorem rates during the period of each of these tariff laws to have been as follows:

	Dutiable	Free and dutiable
	Per cent	Per cent
Under the McKinley law (Republican).....	48.39	23.01
Under the Wilson law (Democratic).....	41.29	20.87
Under the Dingley law (Republican).....	46.49	25.47
Under the Payne-Aldrich law (Republican).....	40.73	19.32
Under the Underwood law (Democratic).....	26.97	9.10
Under the Fordney-McCumber law (Republican).....	37.84	13.92

I regret I can not give the complete corresponding figures with reference to the pending bill, but, generally speaking, the figures show that with respect to manufactured products the dutiable items have been increased approximately 10 per cent and the duties on like agricultural products approximately 35 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting the tables which have been referred to in the course of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. In referring to agricultural products, the gentleman does not mean that the entire agricultural schedule has been increased that much, but only the paragraphs where there were increases?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. What I mean is that the bill as it stands now in the dutiable items upon agriculture shows an average of equivalent ad valorem rates of 54.17 per cent, while the corresponding figure as applied to the tariff act of 1922 is 40.31 per cent, showing that upon the dutiable articles in the agricultural schedules, as compared with the tariff act of 1922, there has been an average increase of 35 per cent.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I think the gentleman should make it plain what he includes besides Schedule 7.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. In the agricultural products to which I have referred and upon which comparisons have been made, both with reference to the tariff act of 1922 and to the pending bill, are included Schedule 5, sugar, molasses, and manufactures thereof; Schedule 7, agricultural products and provisions; and Schedule 11, wool—not manufactures of wool, but the raw wool. The table will show all these differentiations.

Mr. RAMSEYER. On the sugar schedule you take the average of the whole schedule?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The detailed statement shows that on the sugar schedule the tariff act of 1922 contains the average ad valorem equivalent of 67.85 per cent.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is on the entire schedule.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. On the entire sugar schedule; while in this bill the entire sugar schedule shows an equivalent ad valorem duty of 92.39.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Who prepared those figures?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I stated in the beginning that these figures were sent me by the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission and I read from his letter, in which he said:

In response to your request for a comparison of the equivalent ad valorem rates of H. R. 2667 with the tariff act of 1922, and the ad valorem rates of earlier tariff laws, the inclosed tables have been prepared.

He stated further—

The work has been carefully done by our experts, but the tables have not been approved by the commission and are, therefore, tentative and unofficial, and subject to revision.

I will state further, so as to have the information complete, that there are notes at the beginning of the table, making comparisons between the pending bill and the tariff act of 1922, to this purport:

The equivalent ad valorem rates of duty of the tariff act of 1922 are based upon import statistics for the calendar year 1928—

And also—

The ad valorem rates for H. R. 2667 are calculated from the quantity and values of imports for the same year, that is, 1928.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may have two additional minutes. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Has the gentleman got the percentages on Schedule 7 alone?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. On Schedule 7 alone the increase is from 22.79 under the tariff act of 1922 to 31.37 in the pending bill.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I will.

Mr. BURTNESS. Are these figures simply general averages or are they weighted in proportion to the total amount of the imports? I take it they are simple averages.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They are based upon the statistics of imports for the calendar year 1928.

Mr. BURTNESS. The invoice prices for those years are taken for each item, but I take it there is only a simple average of all the separate items and they do not take into consideration the amount of imports for one item as compared with the amount of imports on another item.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The tables show exactly what they are and the Members will have no difficulty, I think, in understanding them and giving them such value as they deserve when they read them in the RECORD.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Does the gentleman have any schedules showing the average raise on the nonagricultural items?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes; the table includes all of the 15 schedules showing the rate of increase in the equivalent ad valorem duties under the tariff act of 1922 and the equivalent

ad valorem duties in the pending bill (H. R. 2667), as applied to every one of the items in the pending bill and in the tariff act of 1922.

The letter from the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission and the tables referred to are as follows:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, May 23, 1929.

Hon. CARL R. CHINDBLOM,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHINDBLOM: In response to your request for a comparison of the equivalent ad valorem rates of H. R. 2667 with the tariff act of 1922 and the ad valorem rates of earlier tariff laws, the inclosed tables have been prepared.

The work has been carefully done by our experts, but the tables have not been approved by the commission and are therefore tentative and unofficial and subject to revision. I hope, however, that they may prove useful to you.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS O. MARVIN.

Equivalent ad valorem rates of duty of H. R. 2667 and tariff act of 1922

(Tentative and unofficial)

[NOTE.—The equivalent ad valorem rates of duty of the tariff act of 1922 are based upon import statistics for the calendar year 1928. The ad valorem rates for H. R. 2667 are calculated from the quantity and values of imports for the same year; that is, 1928.]

Schedules	H. R. 2667 ¹	Tariff act of 1922 ¹
Manufactured products: ²	Per cent	Per cent
1. Chemicals, oils and paints.....	31.76	30.14
2. Earths, earthenware and glassware.....	54.13	45.44
3. Metals and manufactures of.....	39.22	35.03
4. Wood and manufactures of.....	25.42	15.95
9. Manufactures of cotton.....	37.63	36.80
10. Flax, hemp, jute and manufactures of.....	18.21	17.50
11. Manufactures of wool.....	63.07	53.26
12. Manufactures of silk.....	58.80	56.48
13. Manufactures of rayon.....	45.27	52.70
14. Papers and books.....	26.69	25.00
15. Sundries (partial data).....	40.59	36.62
Average for manufactured products.....	38.63	34.78
Agricultural products: ³		
5. Sugar, molasses and manufactures of.....	92.39	67.85
7. Agricultural products and provisions.....	31.37	22.79
11. Wool.....	46.82	42.68
Average for agricultural products.....	54.17	40.31
The following schedules are not included in the above averages:		
6. Tobacco and manufactures of.....	63.09	63.09
8. Spirits, wines, and other beverages.....	43.90	35.89
Average of schedules 6 and 8.....	62.68	62.51

¹ Approximate only.

² Includes in some cases products of mines and forests as well as manufactures of these products.

³ Includes agricultural and marine products and manufactures thereof.

Average rates of duty under specified tariff acts

Acts (fiscal years)	Imports for consumption						Equivalent ad valorem rates	
	Free	Per cent free	Dutiable	Per cent dutiable	Total	Duties collected	Dutiable	Free and dutiable
McKinley law (effective Oct. 6, 1890):								
1891.....	\$379,028,079	44.83	\$466,455,173	55.17	\$845,483,252	\$215,790,686	46.26	25.52
1892.....	448,771,192	55.79	355,526,741	44.21	804,297,933	173,097,670	48.69	21.65
1893.....	432,450,474	51.93	400,282,519	48.07	832,732,993	198,373,453	49.56	23.82
1894.....	372,461,955	59.11	257,645,703	40.89	630,107,658	128,881,868	50.00	20.56
Total McKinley law.....	1,632,711,700	52.45	1,479,910,136	47.55	3,112,621,836	716,143,677	48.39	23.01
Annual average.....	408,177,925	52.45	369,977,534	47.55	778,155,459	179,035,919	48.39	23.01
Wilson law (effective Aug. 28, 1894):								
1895.....	376,890,100	51.55	354,271,990	48.45	731,162,090	147,901,218	41.75	20.23
1896.....	368,897,523	48.56	390,795,561	51.44	759,694,084	156,104,509	39.95	20.55
1897.....	381,902,414	48.39	407,348,616	51.61	789,251,030	171,779,194	42.17	21.76
Total, Wilson law.....	1,127,690,037	49.45	1,152,417,167	50.55	2,280,107,204	475,784,921	41.29	20.87
Annual average.....	375,896,679	49.45	384,139,056	50.55	760,035,735	158,594,974	41.29	20.87
Dingley law (effective July 24, 1897):								
1898.....	291,534,005	49.65	295,619,695	50.35	587,153,700	144,258,563	48.80	24.57
1899.....	299,668,977	43.72	385,772,915	56.28	685,441,892	200,873,429	52.07	29.31
1900.....	366,739,922	44.16	463,759,330	55.84	830,519,252	228,364,556	49.24	27.62
1901.....	339,093,256	41.98	468,670,045	58.02	807,763,301	232,641,499	49.64	28.91
1902.....	306,542,233	44.01	503,251,521	55.99	809,793,754	250,550,428	49.79	27.95
1903.....	437,290,728	43.38	570,669,382	56.62	1,007,960,110	279,779,587	49.03	27.85
1904.....	454,153,100	46.26	527,669,459	53.74	981,822,559	257,330,942	48.77	26.29

Average rates of duty under specified tariff acts—Continued

Acts (fiscal years)	Imports for consumption							
	Free	Per cent free	Dutiable	Per cent dutiable	Total	Duties collected	Equivalent ad valorem rates	
							Dutiable	Free and dutiable
Dingley law (effective July 24, 1897)—Continued.								
1905.....	\$517,073,277	47.56	\$570,044,856	52.44	\$1,087,118,133	\$257,898,130	45.24	23.77
1906.....	548,695,764	45.22	664,721,885	54.78	1,213,417,649	293,557,984	44.16	24.22
1907.....	641,953,451	45.35	773,448,834	54.65	1,415,402,285	329,121,659	42.55	23.28
1908.....	525,704,745	44.43	657,415,920	55.57	1,183,120,665	282,273,432	42.94	23.88
1909.....	699,375,868	46.77	682,265,867	53.23	1,381,641,735	294,377,360	43.15	22.99
Total, Dingley law.....	5,417,845,326	45.22	6,563,309,709	54.78	11,981,155,035	3,051,027,569	46.49	25.47
Annual average.....	451,487,111	45.22	546,942,476	54.78	998,429,586	254,252,297	46.49	25.47
Payne-Aldrich law (effective Aug. 5, 1909):								
1910.....	761,333,117	49.21	785,756,020	50.79	1,547,109,137	326,263,095	41.52	21.09
1911.....	776,963,955	50.85	750,981,697	49.15	1,527,945,652	309,581,944	41.22	20.26
1912.....	881,512,987	53.73	759,209,915	46.27	1,640,722,902	304,597,035	40.12	18.56
1913.....	986,972,333	55.87	779,717,079	44.13	1,766,689,412	312,252,215	40.05	17.67
Total, Payne-Aldrich law.....	3,406,802,392	52.55	3,075,664,711	47.45	6,482,467,103	1,252,694,289	40.73	19.32
Annual average.....	851,700,598	52.55	768,916,178	47.45	1,620,616,776	313,173,572	40.73	19.32
Underwood law (effective Oct. 3, 1913):								
1914.....	1,152,392,059	60.45	754,008,335	39.55	1,906,400,394	283,511,664	37.60	14.87
1915.....	1,032,863,558	62.66	615,522,722	37.34	1,648,386,280	205,755,073	33.43	12.48
1916.....	1,495,881,357	68.65	683,153,244	31.35	2,179,034,601	209,523,151	30.67	9.62
1917.....	1,852,530,536	69.46	814,689,485	30.54	2,667,220,021	221,447,743	27.18	8.30
1918.....	2,117,555,366	73.91	747,338,621	26.09	2,864,893,987	180,196,879	24.11	6.29
1918 (July-December).....	1,149,881,796	71.14	303,079,210	28.86	1,452,961,006	73,907,033	24.39	5.09
1919 (calendar year).....	2,711,462,069	70.84	1,116,221,362	29.16	3,827,683,431	237,402,680	21.27	6.20
1920.....	3,115,958,238	61.08	1,985,865,155	38.92	5,101,823,393	325,635,175	16.40	6.38
1921 ¹	1,564,278,455	61.18	992,591,256	38.82	2,556,869,711	292,359,221	29.45	11.43
1922 ¹	1,888,240,127	61.43	1,185,533,136	38.57	3,073,773,263	451,356,289	38.07	14.68
Total, Underwood law.....	18,081,043,561	66.28	9,198,002,526	33.72	27,279,046,087	2,481,094,808	26.97	9.10
Annual average.....	1,903,267,743	66.28	968,210,792	33.72	2,871,478,535	261,167,872	26.97	9.10
Fordney-McCumber law (effective Sept. 22, 1922):								
1923.....	2,165,148,317	58.02	1,566,621,499	41.98	3,731,769,816	566,663,978	36.17	15.18
1924.....	2,118,167,861	59.25	1,456,883,421	40.75	3,575,051,282	532,393,286	36.54	14.89
1925.....	2,708,827,567	64.86	1,467,390,501	35.11	4,176,218,068	551,814,156	37.61	13.21
1926.....	2,908,107,735	65.97	1,499,968,523	34.03	4,408,076,258	590,038,433	39.34	13.39
1927.....	2,680,058,949	64.38	1,483,030,851	35.62	4,163,089,800	574,838,964	38.76	13.81
1928.....	2,678,633,207	65.69	1,399,303,932	34.31	4,077,937,139	542,264,621	38.75	13.30
Total, Fordney-McCumber law.....	15,258,943,636	63.23	8,873,198,727	36.77	24,132,142,363	3,358,013,438	37.84	13.92
Annual average.....	2,543,157,273	63.23	1,478,866,454	36.77	4,022,023,727	559,668,906	37.84	13.92

¹ The emergency tariff act became effective on certain agricultural products on May 27, 1921, and continued in effect until Sept. 22, 1922.

The Clerk read to line 8, page 3.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 108, lines 9 to 11: Strike out "cattle weighing less than 1,050 pounds each, 1½ cents per pound; weighing 1,050 pounds each, 2 cents per pound," and insert "cattle weighing less than 800 pounds, 2 cents per pound; weighing 800 pounds or more each, 2½ cents per pound."

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a change in the bill as originally reported by the committee. It is an amendment in favor of those who sell cattle on the hoof. In the bill as printed there was no change from the law of 1922. Since 1922 the conditions in the marketing of cattle have changed. They sell them younger, and consequently at a lower weight for each animal. This change, so far as the market is concerned, meets the modern commercial conditions, changing the bracket to 800 pounds instead of 1,000 pounds.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. What is the average weight of cattle imported?

Mr. HAWLEY. In 1927 about 540 pounds on the average per head for those weighing less than 1,050 pounds.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Above 800 pounds?

Mr. HAWLEY. In 1927 about 1,200 pounds per head on the average for those weighing over 1,050 pounds.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Has the gentleman the figures as to the number of cattle imported?

Mr. HAWLEY. According to the Tariff Commission 427,434 were imported in 1927. During 1928 the live weight of imports was over 250,000,000 pounds. The number for that year is not given in the summary of tariff information.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Has the gentleman the figures of the separate classes?

Mr. HAWLEY. Only as stated above. Witnesses have stated to us that there was an increase in the number of cattle imported in 1928 and that cattle came in in excess of 500,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How do these figures show a reflection in the price of beef?

Mr. HAWLEY. The increase would depend on the state of the market. I do not think this duty will effect an increase in costs to consumers generally. The change in the rate of duty is based on the duty on beef of 6 cents per pound. That was taken by the committee as the basic factor on all meat products on which a duty is levied. The change from 1,050 pounds to 800 pounds was a change of a half cent in the lower bracket and from 2 to 2½ cents in the higher bracket to adjust the duties on live cattle to the duty on beef. After careful examination we think it is a fair adjustment. The cattle population of the country has decreased. The demand for meat will continue. The only way to get an increased population of cattle is to make it profitable to the growers of cattle to keep their heifers for breeding purposes. This is designed to permit the cattle population to grow in the country and be restored to normal figures.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This tariff was supposed to be revised principally to aid the farmer; that we all admit; but the tariff placed on imported beef and lamb is outrageous.

It is admitted by all the packers in Chicago that, as a result of decreased production during the last five years, beef has increased to the point that it can not be sold to the masses, and there is no profit for the distributor. This is conceded by Wilson, Armour, Swift, and Cudahy in their reports; and their remarks can be found in the tariff hearings, volume 7, schedule 7, page 3947, fresh meats.

I would also like to refer to Mr. Alfred H. Benjamin's brief on page 3951, containing important statistics dealing with the cattle in this country, showing there was a decrease of 1,800,000 cattle during the last five years; but, notwithstanding that decrease, the cattle on hand had increased to the extent of \$500,000,000. The figures quoted in the brief referred to were taken from the Year Book of the Department of Commerce, 1928, volume 1, Table 70, page 246, which shows a big increase in livestock prices in 1927.

Think of it! We now pay \$1 for four lamb chops, and the price of steak is beyond reach of the workingman's dining table.

I am told it takes five years, at least, to produce cattle. If we increase the tariff at this time, every family in this country will be taxed for the next three years from \$1,000 to \$1,500 per annum over and above the present high cost of living.

The vital necessities of life, and particularly for the Nation, are meat, butter, milk, cream, and sugar, and all of these commodities call for an increase of 100 per cent under this new tariff.

During the past year, with the prevailing high prices on all meat products, it has been difficult for the average wage earner to purchase meats. The meat consumption has not declined in localities where people have money enough to buy it; but it is a pitiful sight in a meat market to find women, who, formerly were able to buy enough meat to properly feed a family, picking around from item to item and then have sufficient money to buy meat for only half the family.

This is true of your Government employees, living on a starving wage, right here in the Capital City. I know many who have tried to budget, and found these economic experts failed to give the true prices on foodstuffs, in order to arrive at certain conclusions.

The small amount of foreign meat products imported helps reduce the cost for those who badly need it, and the so-called "chain stores" have been a godsend to the working class, which is the backbone of the Nation.

To place an embargo on this food product will put the domestic meat at such a value that it will curtail consumption and destroy the object for which it was intended.

The President of the United States, in his message to Congress, said:

I have called this special session of Congress to redeem two pledges given in the last election—farm relief and limited changes in the tariff.

We have been in session more than five weeks. Nothing has been accomplished of benefit to the farmer to date.

It has often been said that the power to tax is also the power to destroy. We all believe in a protective tariff—we must, to save our own industries, whether we come from north, south, east, or west. However, the building up of a high wall of tariff around the things that the people of the United States must buy is serious and will limit the amount of things that they would like to buy. Tariff should be written without any sectional interest.

I have tried to be fair and study both sides of the argument and digest some of the reports of the hearings before the committee. Many will acknowledge it to be a rather difficult task, and I am talking simply from the standpoint of the housewife, or the "consumer," so often referred to in this debate.

I can not, in all fairness, see any logic in the proposed tax on sugar. It seems to me we are placing this heavy duty on the people of the United States to save a few acres of land in certain States where they raise sugar beets and employ Mexican labor and women and children, violating all our labor laws.

Some ambitious gentlemen are trying to foster an industry here and reclaim land at the expense of the American people. If this bill becomes a law, I am informed, this Republican Congress will place a charge on the people of the United States on this one item alone of \$240,000,000 a year.

Why should we make the consumer bear the cost of foreign labor on sugar-beet industry in the United States when we can get it so cheaply from our island possessions? Sugar is one of our most-valued products. It is necessary to life. Why destroy our Territories by placing such a tariff on sugar? It is not economic, not sound. It is not the beet grower that will be benefited by this vicious increase but the beet-sugar manufacturer; the dirt farmer never seems to get anything, because it is not the tiller of the soil who is considered but the manufacturer, always. It is the manufacturer who contributes to the campaign; therefore he receives his reward in tariff, a despicable custom, but true.

I also protest against hides being taken off the free list. It will not benefit the farmer but only increase his cost of living, for he will be bound to pay more money for his boots and shoes. We all pay enough now. Only the large packers would be favored by placing a tariff on hides.

I am willing to protect the boot and shoe industry by placing a duty on shoes and finished leather to offset the foreign competition, especially in women's fancy shoes; but I am not in favor of taking hides off the free list. What this industry needs is free raw material and protection for its products. The domestic supply of hides is decreasing and importations are increasing rapidly.

I am not an alarmist, but I see in this situation of unnecessarily burdening our people a far greater cause of dissatisfaction

than in anything that has ever happened and a big step forward to encourage "red" sentiment in this country.

Then, too, raising a high tariff wall certainly is not a step toward world peace. We talk about peace. We spend millions and millions of the taxpayers' money to build new implements of war to insure peace and protect our shores, while we neglect the greatest implement of peace in all the world, "brotherly love."

We call ourselves "allies," yet raise a barrier wall of tariff so high that it is equivalent to serving notice on the nations of the world that we do not want their goods, even at the loss of their friendship.

We are so well satisfied with ourselves we prefer to live alone. Of course, we will magnanimously sell to them; but we do not want to buy from them. And the worst part of it is that we pretend it is because we would help the working people of our country and keep them employed; when, as a matter of fact, for every extra dollar the working man or woman is paid in wages they spend a dollar and a half in food and clothing to make up for that extra dollar.

What a sham! What hypocrisy! How long do you think it will take the working men and women of the Nation to wake up? Do you not think they know who really gets the extra dollar?

Certainly not the dirt farmer whom you are pretending to assist. He is usually a pretty wise man, says little but thinks much; and while I confess he did not show much wisdom in the last election, he will have four years more to realize his mistake, and maybe we will have better luck next time.

If I were not thinking of the already overburdened housewife and her undernourished children, I would encourage you to build a higher tariff wall, realizing that it would be so much easier for my party to be returned in 1930; but not even to realize this ambition would I hesitate to plead with you to think twice before you place a greater burden on our people and prevent our children from getting the food they require to build their bodies.

Members of Congress have lost much of the respect that was and should be rightfully ours. We do work hard; many of us think straight; and, therefore, we should not allow a group of reactionary Republican leaders, working in the interest of powerful corporations, to lead us away from the service we solemnly swore to render to all the people of our country. Such procedure is not only dangerous from a party point of view, but it is inhuman and endangers the lives of the people we have sworn to protect.

Since I came to Congress many fine men have passed to the great beyond. When they came to the judgment seat to render an account of their stewardship, which service do you think counted in their favor? Their service to humanity or their service to the Power Trusts and overlords of the business world?

The higher tariff on foodstuffs is indefensible. To satisfy the greed of a minority, it will work great hardship on the majority; and I can not believe that any Member of Congress will deliberately do this great injustice to the already discouraged poor people of the country.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BECK, in his brilliant speech on Wednesday sounded a note of warning, which I hope will be considered by even the superprotectionists.

President Hoover started his journey to the White House through feeding the starving children of Europe. He was supported then by a great leader—President Wilson.

I sincerely hope his journey away from the White House may not begin through neglect of the children of his own country.

Let him show his leadership now and prove to all the people of the country that he is big enough for the great position he was elected to fill. [Applause.]

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment to increase duties on live cattle.

I am astounded at the conclusions reached by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] with reference to this amendment and her opposition thereto. The adoption of this amendment can not under any circumstances increase the cost of meat. The purpose of this amendment is to try to yield back to the grower of cattle, to the farmer, the protection that is provided by the duty of 6 cents upon the finished beef product. Even under the increase proposed by this amendment the duty upon the live animal will remain at a substantially lower figure, as I see it, than the duty upon the finished product from that live animal. In other words, there is still not only a sufficient compensatory duty but also a substantial protective duty in addition remaining upon the finished product as compared with the duty upon this raw material, the cattle on the hoof.

But another question of more importance to the consumers than the one that has been submitted by the gentlewoman from

New Jersey, and the conclusion that she has drawn from it, is this, that a sufficient duty on the live animal, on cattle, will stabilize the production of cattle in the United States. You will not be so likely to have the situation that has existed during the last seven or eight years, for it was the tremendous drop in the market price of cattle in 1920 and 1921, brought about by tremendous importations of beef and other reasons, which caused the farmers to sell their stock and largely discontinue the raising of beef cattle. What was the inevitable result? You have relatively few cattle upon the farms of this country to-day, and a year or two ago there were even less, and the result was that you have been paying high prices for your beef now for a couple of years. With the sort of tariff protection provided in this bill, and I hope before it is finally signed the rate on live cattle may be a little larger than now proposed, we will be able to stabilize the production of cattle upon the farms of this country, so that the production will be substantially the same from year to year. The farmers and stockmen will not fear ruinous competition from Argentina, Canada, or any other place. That will stabilize the price of meat for the consumers just as thoroughly as it will tend to stabilize the price for the producer, preventing undue fluctuations, and that is for the best interests of all alike. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I regret to note that the very first speech made from the Democratic side of the House after opening the bill for amendment is in opposition to a tariff duty asked for by the agricultural sections of the country. I would rather see the men and women on the Democratic side of the aisle support these rates asked by the farmer, just as I expect to see my colleagues on the Republican side vote for them.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. This amendment grants only a part of the request unanimously made by the representatives of 15 cattle-producing States of the West.

Mr. BURTNESS. That is very true. We asked for 2½ cents and 3 cents in the respective divisions. The amendment is one-half cent less. The changing of the arbitrary division from 1,050 pounds in the bill to 800 pounds as proposed in the amendment is of great importance in the matter, perhaps fully as much as the increase of one-half a cent a pound on the various classes of livestock. It makes finished baby beef take the higher rate, so on that we are getting a cent increase. This is true of all cattle weighing between 800 and 1,050 pounds. We asked that the division be placed at 700, but the committee has recommended 800 pounds. I presented the case for the increase at length in the House a few days ago showing production, importations, duty on the live animal as compared with the probable finished beef therefrom.

I want to emphasize again that if there is any duty in this bill which will increase the price to the consumer of meat it is not this amendment that is under consideration now, but rather the rate upon the finished product. That rate is not now under attack and I submit it is fair. Surely no one will deny the producer of the raw material the right to have his fair share, whatever that fair share may be, of the ultimate duty on the finished, and this represents what the Ways and Means Committee has determined to be the fair share of that ultimate duty. Some of us think the share is still too low, but we are glad to accept it.

As the member chosen by the conference of 15 States interested, and over which conference the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] presided, to present our case for an increase to the Ways and Means Committee I take this opportunity of thanking the Committee on Ways and Means for the consideration given me in that presentation and to us all in the 15 States in reporting the amendment favorably. It should now be adopted by the House. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it seems somewhat remarkable, after listening to the Democratic oratory during general debate to the effect that this is a session called primarily in the interest of the farmer, to find the first speech coming from the Democratic side under the 5-minute rule against a schedule in which farmers of the country are vitally interested. That is a sample of Democratic tariff principles.

The remarks of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Norton] might well be expected to be delivered by the president of one of the great packing interests. I represent a city district and would suggest to the gentlewoman from New Jersey and the rest of the Democrats who follow her that if they want relief for the consumer they go after those packing interests who are opposing this schedule and do not in the name of the consumer oppose this tariff protection, which will benefit the farmer. The problems of the workingmen in the city and the farmers are mutual. When the industrial workers of the city

are walking the streets out of employment or working for low wages, then they can not pay decent prices for the products of the farmer. When the farmer does not receive a proper price for his products due to importation of foreign products or otherwise, he can not purchase the products of the industrial workers in the cities. This special session of Congress was primarily called in the interest of farm relief legislation, and the Representatives from the city districts should lend their aid to help the farmers.

I would be willing as the Representative of an industrial city to vote for a higher rate than that proposed in the pending amendment. Let us work for the interest of all of the people and not the selfish interests of some particular congressional district. [Applause on Republican side.]

Mr. LOZIER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. LOZIER. To support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, this amendment certainly ought to be adopted. [Applause.] It ought to be adopted for the reason that the farmer needs some compensation for the unconscionably high duties imposed by this bill upon what he buys. [Applause.]

The bill will take away from the farmer much more than it gives him. In comparison to the benefits this bill gives the manufacturers, it gives the farmers practically nothing.

I hold in my hand a copy of the American Farm Bureau Federation News Letter, the official organ of the American Farm Bureau Federation. It gives the result of an investigation made by the department of research of that great farm organization as to the effect of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill on the agricultural classes in America. It shows that under the cattle schedule of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act the actual gain annually to the American farmers, in the increased price of their cattle, is \$1,500,000. But this amount must be reduced by \$1,000,000, which represents the additional cost the farmers pay on their feeder cattle by reason of this act, and this \$1,000,000 is paid directly out of the pockets of the American farmers, giving the farmers a net benefit under the cattle schedule of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill of only one-half million dollars. The American Farm Bureau Federation further finds that the total annual cost to all the people of the United States resulting from the tariff on cattle under the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill was only \$1,800,000, \$1,000,000 of which came out of the pockets of the American farmers, and only \$800,000 from the pockets of the consuming classes generally.

The present bill increases substantially the duties on cattle and beef products, which is due the farmer to help make up the enormous sums he is compelled to pay for his supplies by reason of tariff schedules that are indefensibly high, most certainly the farmer should get a little something out of this bill. The bill under consideration was drafted by the representatives of industrial and consuming elements of this Nation. This is a manufacturer's bill and not a farmer's bill. For every dollar added to the farmer's income by this tariff on agricultural products this bill will extract from his pocket \$5 by increasing the cost of his supplies. It is conservatively estimated that the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill increased the annual income of the farmers only \$29,900,000, while it increased the cost of what he had to buy \$331,000,000. An after taking into consideration all the gains from the Fordney-McCumber Act and all the additional expenses imposed on the farmers by reason of that act, the American Farm Bureau found that the present tariff law cost the American farmers over \$301,000,000 annually. This was after all gains and losses to the agricultural classes had been considered. That is to say, according to the finding of this great farm organization, the Fordney-McCumber Act took out of the pockets of the American farmer \$10 for every dollar it added to his income.

The pending tariff bill is not a bill for the relief or benefit of American agriculture, because for every dime it adds to the farmers' income it increases his living expenses at least \$1. Instead of helping the farmer, this bill will add to the almost unbearable burden under which agriculture groans.

For years the American cattle raiser has been facing what looked like inevitable disaster. As this bill largely increases the tariff on the products from mills and factories, there is no reason why the cattle grower should not be given a fair measure of protection. Millions of cattle are grown and fattened at a low cost on the great pampas or plains of Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Brazil. On these far-flung ranges the pampas grass is exceedingly nutritious, and the cost of producing beef much less than in the United States. The pack-

ing houses at Montevideo and Buenos Aires, owned principally by the great Chicago packers, are superbly equipped and are the last word on packing-house construction and appliances. These cattle, grown and fattened on cheap wild land, on grasses that hardens the fat almost as perfectly as corn, are slaughtered in these South American packing plants, their carcasses frozen, and in refrigerator ships carried across the equator to England and other European countries, where this meat enters into competition with beef grown on high-priced farms in the Middle West and fattened on corn grown on high-priced land.

And inasmuch as the cattle grower pays a high tribute to the manufacturers on commodities from the mills and factories, then, in fairness and reason, the farmer ought to be given a tariff on beef and other farm products. The farmer will not ask a tariff on any of his products if you will take the tariff off of what he has to buy.

We should not be deceived by the provisions of this bill. It is essentially a bill to add to the already excessive profits of the manufacturers. It is a bill to increase the tariff on the products of the mills and factories. It was not written by the friends of the farmer. It was written and is now being championed by the men who have in season and out of season fought all farm relief legislation. Almost every line was dictated or agreed to by the men who in this House speak for the industrial classes, and who are the faithful servants of big business and special privileges. Here and there the farmer is given a sop, but only a sop to fool him and keep him quiet a little while longer.

This bill will cause the Republican Party plenty of grief. It will unreasonably augment the profits of the industrial group and add to the burden that is now bending the backs of the common people almost to the breaking point. As a whole, this bill is vicious and absolutely indefensible. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the committee's amendment. I move to amend the committee's amendment by striking out, on page 108, line 12, the figure "6" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "4."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 108, line 12, strike out the figure "6" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "4."

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment. It is not an amendment to the committee amendment now pending.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would like to be heard on the point of order. That is one of the chief purposes of the amendment, so that we can get a proper interpretation of the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. It is an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is not an amendment to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from Oregon on the point of order.

Mr. HAWLEY. The amendment offered by the committee was to the first part of paragraph 701, relating to duties on live cattle. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York does not affect this amendment at all. He offers it to another part of the paragraph which is entirely separate from the amendment offered by the committee.

Mr. BURTNESS. In addition to what the chairman of the committee has said, may I say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York does not change by one word the committee amendment, but he proceeds to propose his amendment to an entirely different subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, under the rule adopted by the House, amendments may be offered only by the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman from Oregon has offered a committee amendment to paragraph 701 on page 108, changing the provision as to the weight of cattle and certain rates thereon. In that same paragraph a duty is provided for beef and veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen, 6 cents a pound. My amendment amends the amendment offered by the committee to that same paragraph.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I can not originate an amendment under the rule.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. The gentleman can when the paragraph is reached.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Not under the rule. We are on this paragraph now.

Mr. BURTNESS. The paragraph has not been read.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. An amendment has been offered by the committee, and once this amendment is voted on, every Member of the House is foreclosed from offering any amendment to this paragraph. If that is not so, and if this rule opens any paragraph to amendment, and Members of the House are permitted to offer amendments to any paragraph, then I will withdraw my amendment and apologize for voting against the rule. But that is not so. The fact is that now, and now only, is an opportunity afforded for any Member, outside of the committee, to offer an amendment to this paragraph. The portion of the paragraph to which I have offered an amendment is an integral part of the paragraph. The paragraph refers to cattle and beef and they are related. Therefore my amendment to the committee amendment is proper under the rule adopted by the House.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, one further word. The paragraph is not before the committee, not having been read or reached in the ordinary course in the reading of the bill. The only matter before the committee is the amendment offered by the committee, and it happens to be located in this particular part of the bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the same schedule.

Mr. HAWLEY. The only matter to which an amendment can be offered is the amendment reported by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from New York, of course, is in order to offer any amendment to the committee amendment that is germane to the committee amendment that is now before the committee. Paragraph 701 deals with several items—cattle, beef and veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen, as well as tallow. The only amendment before the committee at the present time is one dealing with live cattle, so that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York dealing with canned meat, in the opinion of the Chair, is not germane to that amendment; and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the Chair pass upon this question: After the committee amendment has been disposed of, is this paragraph open to amendments offered by Members of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. Not unless the chairman of the committee offers an amendment to the specific subject which a Member may desire to amend.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is my understanding, and that is why I voted against the rule.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not care to discuss the pending amendment, but I have a few short tables on the cattle population of the United States; another table on the imports of cattle; another table on the imports of meat products, covering a 10-year period, and then I have a fourth table of differences in cost between the United States and Canada. I ask unanimous consent to have these tables inserted in the RECORD at this place.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to print certain tables in the RECORD as indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The tables referred to follow:

Year	All cattle and calves on farms	Number slaughtered		
		Cattle	Calves	Total
1919	70,261,000	14,838,000	8,445,000	23,283,000
1920	68,871,000	13,885,000	8,455,000	22,340,000
1921	67,184,000	12,271,000	7,771,000	20,042,000
1922	67,264,000	13,148,000	8,363,000	21,511,000
1923	68,156,000	13,883,000	8,824,000	22,707,000
1924	64,507,000	14,400,000	9,466,000	23,866,000
1925	61,996,000	14,706,000	10,099,000	24,805,000
1926	59,122,000	14,971,000	9,542,000	24,513,000
1927	56,872,000	14,000,000	9,030,000	23,030,000
1928	55,696,000			

Imports of cattle, 1919 to 1928

Fiscal year	From	
	Canada	Mexico
	Number	Number
1919	356,549	88,778
1920	495,595	98,604
1921	299,981	31,196
1922	133,008	43,538
1923	234,454	40,816
1924	148,726	54,845
1925	128,674	73,192
1926	175,581	95,754
1927	169,665	184,447
1928	209,715	207,487

Imports of meat products from Canada and South America, 1919 to 1928

Fiscal year	From Canada	From Argentina	From Brazil	From Uruguay
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds
1919	45,548,717	79,882,889	6,131,237	28,991,299
1920	41,182,563	8,559,631		631,490
1921	43,414,747	17,882,701	235,000	3,955,754
1922	29,035,286	4,961,983	431,854	5,297,696
1923	20,760,362	18,069,159	919,058	9,192,414
1924	20,574,069	10,553,904	101,700	6,314,350
1925	17,338,035	11,418,943	219,194	2,853,722
1926	23,387,160	11,104,688	472,884	8,046,593
1927	46,599,937	20,992,037	1,785,990	13,378,034
1928	76,475,822	19,753,363	1,650,672	20,532,789

¹No fresh or frozen meats allowed entry from these countries since Jan. 1, 1927, on account of foot and mouth disease.

Beef cattle—Cost of production, including transportation to normal markets and to Chicago, by States and Provinces, and average cost, United States and Canada, 1927

(Dollars per 100 pounds, live weight)

Area	Average cost at ranch	Transportation cost to normal market	Total cost at normal markets in United States	Transportation cost to Chicago	Total cost at Chicago
North Dakota	\$0.55	\$0.86	\$10.41	\$0.86	\$10.41
South Dakota	0.67	.64	10.31	.81	10.48
Montana	8.74	.94	9.68	.94	9.68
Wyoming	9.25	.71	9.96	1.00	10.25
Nebraska	7.38	.43	7.81	.86	8.24
Colorado	10.92	.50	11.42	.83	11.75
Utah	10.19	.80	10.97	1.06	11.23
New Mexico	6.58	.75	7.33	1.00	7.58
Average, United States ¹	8.80	.61	9.50	.88	9.77
Canada I ²	6.16	.70	6.86	1.22	7.38
Canada II ³	9.02	.86	9.88	1.53	10.55
Canada III ⁴	9.43	.72	10.15	1.62	11.05
Average, Canada ⁵	7.42	.75	8.17	1.36	8.78
Excess of United States over Canada	1.47	-.14	1.33	-.48	.99

¹Weighted on the basis of total movement of cattle (3,995,814 head) from all the States specified, as reported by U. S. Department of Agriculture. Nebraska supplied 34.2 per cent of this total; Colorado, 18.6 per cent; New Mexico, 4.7 per cent; Utah, 5 per cent; North Dakota, 10.1 per cent; South Dakota, 13.7 per cent; Wyoming, 5.7 per cent; and Montana, 8 per cent.

²Western Saskatchewan and eastern Alberta.

³Western Alberta.

⁴British Columbia.

⁵Weighted as above. Out of a total of 428,097 head, Area I supplied 57.9 per cent; Area II, 28.1 per cent; and Area III, 14 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAWLEY: Page 109, line 20, strike out "1½" and insert in lieu thereof "2½."

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, this has reference to dried skimmed milk. The rate as proposed in the bill originally was computed by the experts of the Tariff Commission as a proper compensating duty, but upon review of their figures they found that with milk at 5 cents a gallon the proper compensating duty on dried skimmed milk should be 2½ cents per pound. This simply adjusts the compensating duty in the proper relation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSEYER: Page 109, line 23, strike out "12" and insert in lieu thereof "14," and page 109, line 24, strike out "12" and insert in lieu thereof "14."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment that it is not a proper amendment within the meaning of the rule adopted by the House to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

LXXI—119

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the Chairman read the amendment? It is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a committee amendment.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The Clerk did not so read. I only know what the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa stated when he rose that he offered a committee amendment.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The Clerk read, "Amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa."

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman was authorized by the committee to offer the amendment. The point of order is overruled, and the gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is an amendment to increase by 2 cents the rates on butter and butter substitutes. The bill as originally prepared by the committee fixed the rate on butter at 12 cents and the related products, milk, cream, and so forth, on that basis.

The butter rate was fixed on a cost study between the United States and Denmark, and the 12 cents represents an increase from 8 cents to 12 cents, which was made by the President April 5, 1928.

After the bill was reported—in fact, during the hearings held during the past week by the Republican members of the committee, and before which appeared both Republican and Democratic Members of the House, this is one of the subjects that was brought up—and the claim was made that the rate was too low.

I personally took this matter up with the Tariff Commission, and there found some cost studies that they had on the production of butter in Canada and in the United States, and also between New Zealand and the United States.

The cost studies made by the Tariff Commission a few years ago between this country and Denmark showed a difference of 12.92 cents per pound.

The President increased the duty to the limit—that is, 50 per cent—which raised it from 8 cents to 12 cents.

In the Tariff Commission there is a report on butter obtained from a special report of the Canadian House of Commons showing the cost of producing butter in Ontario. Based on this report, the cost difference between Canada and this country is 13.25 cents per pound.

Then we have two reports in possession of the Tariff Commission on the costs in New Zealand, one is from the Wisconsin Experiment Station, which was conducted in New Zealand by Dean Russell and Professor Macklin, men who have the confidence of members of the Tariff Commission. Upon this study it is shown that the cost of producing butter in New Zealand is 27.9 per cent less than in Denmark.

At the time the butter study was made by the Tariff Commission of the United States, a gentleman by the name of Mr. S. Sorenson, of Denmark, was here and testified as an expert before the commission on the cost of producing butter in Denmark. From here he went to New Zealand and conducted a cost study on producing butter in New Zealand. Mr. Sorenson's report shows that the cost of producing butter in New Zealand is 25 per cent less than in Denmark. Remember, now, that the 12 cents we have now on butter is based on the cost difference between Denmark and the United States.

This report from the Wisconsin Experiment Station and the report made by Mr. Sorenson, of Denmark, one found that the cost of producing butter was 27.9 per cent less in New Zealand than in Denmark, and the other found 25 per cent less in New Zealand than in Denmark, are almost together. On this basis the difference in producing a pound of butter in New Zealand and the United States is about 19 cents per pound.

The committee therefore determined to recommend to the House an increase from 12 cents to 14 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. This 14 cents equalizes the difference in cost between the United States and Canada. If the New Zealand competition should become injurious, then after the Tariff Commission has investigated, the President having the power to increase or decrease 50 per cent, could take care of that situation.

The committee does not recommend a change in any of the rates in the related paragraphs to butter.

On milk we increased the duty from 2½ cents to 5 cents a gallon. This is on the basis of 12 cents on butter, and the cream we increased from 20 cents to 48 cents per gallon.

The question may arise, if we increase butter from 12 cents to 14 cents, why should we not increase the other products in the milk paragraphs. Since the hearings before the committee closed the Tariff Commission made a report to the President as to the differences in the costs of producing milk and cream in the United States and in Canada, and this report shows that the cost difference in milk amounts to 4.3 cents per gallon. The rate in the bill is 5 cents a gallon.

The difference in cost of producing cream in the United States and in Canada is 41.2 cents per gallon, and the rate in the bill is 48 cents a gallon. On the basis of the differences in costs of producing milk and cream, no changes are necessary in the proposed rates in the bill.

Mr. KETCHAM. Before the gentleman leaves that point, will he yield for one question?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Referring to New Zealand and their production cost of butter, is it not also necessary that we have a differential higher than the one against Canada for the simple reason that they produce their surplus at the very time when our production costs are the highest?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Their winter comes during our summer, and vice versa.

Mr. KETCHAM. And, consequently, their costs are lowest when our costs are highest.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; and the committee is of the opinion that this 14 cents will take care of that situation.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman explain to the members of the committee why it is that the committee in its wisdom is not recommending to the House an additional tariff on the product of dried whole milk in view of the raise in the rates on butter?

Mr. RAMSEYER. When you take into consideration that this late report of the Tariff Commission shows the differences in the costs of producing milk and cream in the United States and in Canada are less than the rates in the bill on milk and cream, and although we have not the difference in cost of production of dried milk, if such a study were made, it would probably be found that the rates in the bill are high enough to equalize the cost difference in this country and Canada.

Mr. WOODRUFF. What I had in mind was not the difference in cost between this country and Canada but the condition that exists in the importation from Scandinavian countries. They are importing thousands of tons of dried milk, and it seems to me that this is an opportune time for the Ways and Means Committee to recognize the situation.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The proposed rates in the bill on dried milk represent a considerable increase over the existing law and should take care of the situation the gentleman has in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. Mr. Chairman, after the Committee on Ways and Means had given this matter a great deal of study they reported the bill leaving butter at 12 cents a pound. This was no mere accident, it was the result of very careful study, and there was considerable data available, because the Tariff Commission had made a study of butter conditions, and the rate was increased from 8 cents to 12 cents not very long ago. Under the 12-cent rate the importation of Danish butter practically stopped. Figures will bear me out on that.

It is true that New Zealand is producing butter, but New Zealand is not exporting any great amount of butter to the United States. You will find a very heavy exportation of butter from New Zealand to the Philippines, and the greater part of that butter is consumed by the United States Army in the Philippines.

If you want to cut off the New Zealand market you can do so by writing into the appropriation bill for the Army that all food for the Army in the Philippines shall be purchased in the United States. It would not be necessary to write that into the appropriation bill if the 15 States which represent agriculture would go to the Quartermaster General and point out that the United States Army in the Philippines is consuming New Zealand butter. By doing that they might bring about the desired result.

But I submit that there is no justification for an increase of duty from 12 to 14 cents on butter, because there is very little butter being imported. Butter is so expensive now that it is a luxury. Much has been said about the producer, the industrial worker, and the farmer, but let me say to you that if you run the price up so high that the consumers are not able to purchase butter it will not do any good.

Mr. BURTNESS. Does the gentleman wish to eat foreign butter instead of domestic butter?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We are consuming American butter in New York. There is no importation to speak of, and I say there is no justification for this increase in duty.

Mr. BURTNESS. The gentleman knows that the Tariff Commission would have recommended a larger increase if the law had warranted it, and the report shows that a larger increase in duty was justified.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not know anything of the kind. Will the gentleman from North Dakota say that there is a large amount of butter imported into this country?

Mr. BURTNESS. I am not raising that question.

Mr. BEEDY. The gentleman from New York does not mean to contend that the only justification for an increase of duty is where the imports bear a large proportion to the consumption in this country?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am trying to carry out the formula contained in the President's message. He says he does not approve a general revision, but there should be an adjustment of certain schedules where in a given industry it can be shown that business has fallen off by reason of importations since the act of 1922.

Mr. BEEDY. Does not the gentleman know that importations, as in the case of potatoes of 1 per cent, is enough to break the market on potatoes, which is a product of American labor, and that is what we want to protect?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, the gentleman is not serious when he predicts that an importation of 1 per cent will break the market.

Mr. BEEDY. It is not a case of prediction; it is a fact; it is history.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. I rise to propose an amendment to the committee amendment by making the rate on butter 19 cents a pound.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL of Wisconsin to the committee amendment: Page 109, line 23, strike out "14 cents" and insert "19 cents."

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I can not say very much about butter production or the butter schedule in five minutes, but you have heard the testimony here, from the gentleman from the Ways and Means Committee, to the effect that the difference in the cost of production of butter in Wisconsin, one of the great butter-producing States of the Nation, and he might also have said in Minnesota and Iowa, and the cost of production in New Zealand is 19 cents per pound. If you gentlemen believe in the idea of protecting the farmer in his home market and in equalizing the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, then I ask you to vote for this amendment providing a tariff of 19 cents per pound, which the Committee on Ways and Means member has testified is the proper amount to cover that difference in cost.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the committee amendment. I was under the impression that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] was for the farmers, but hearing his talk here this afternoon on the question of the increase of 2 cents a pound in the rate on butter, it seems to me that he has deserted the farmers of this country. He referred to 15 States that are involved in the matter of this question of butter. Why, every farmer in the United States who has a dairy cow will be benefited by this increase in the tariff. It is not a sectional proposition; it is a national proposition, and it is the only agricultural tariff where all of the farmers in the country will be benefited, and we are asking for this increase from 12 to 14 cents for that reason.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman does not want the 19 cents?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Further, the gentleman states that the Tariff Commission recommended certain changes in the tariff on butter, based on an investigation some years ago. At that time, in 1924, Denmark was the principal competing country, and the Tariff Commission naturally took the principal competing country and the conditions they found there, but the situation has changed since then and New Zealand to-day is the principal competing country, and the difference in the cost of production there and here is 18 cents per pound, less transportation. The farmers are entitled to have 15 cents on butter, but they will be satisfied with the 14 cents at the present time and then appear before the Tariff Commission for further increase when conditions demand it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman, then, is supporting the committee amendment and not the amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. ANDRESEN. I rose in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is some relief.

Mr. ANDRESEN. As far as raising the cost to the consumers of butter is concerned, I say to the Members of the House that they need have no fear as to a rise in the price of butter on account of this increase in the tariff, for the reason that the farmers are not to-day receiving the full benefit of the 12-cent tariff.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Not now. The imports are from four to eight million pounds a year. In 1927 the imports were approximately eight and a half million pounds and last year they were four and a half million pounds. As far as the importations are concerned, the speculators in butter in the eastern market encouraged the shipment of one single cargo into our market in order to depress the price of butter produced in this country. In January, 1928, we found that the speculators in New York, and probably in other places, were interested in depressing the price of American-made butter. They were successful in doing so, and they depressed the price five and a half cents a pound. The farmers up in my State in one little cooperative institution alone lost over \$300,000 by virtue of the action of those speculators.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows that we have no love for speculators, because they are not doing us any good.

Mr. ANDRESEN. And what did they do on top of that? They stored our butter and sold the New Zealand butter, and waited until the price came back, and then they took advantage of a 5½-cent margin on the butter that they had bought, which was produced in the United States. This increase of 14 cents should be adopted unanimously by the Members of this House.

Mr. CLAGUE. Was it not just one shipload that depressed the price of butter 5½ cents a pound?

Mr. ANDRESEN. Just one cargo.

Mr. LOZIER. As a sincere friend of the dairy industry, I am wondering whether or not these high tariffs, the exceedingly high tariff on butter, will not in fact in a few years injure the dairy interests by so stimulating it as to produce overproduction. It takes several years to transfer from a growing of beef cattle to butter cattle. It seems to me that the dairy interests ought to be careful and not demand a duty that will result in overproduction, which will mean, of course, ultimate heavy depression in the price.

Mr. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman had looked at the statistics he would have found that there is one heifer calf born for every four people in the United States, so that the heifer-calf population will have to increase materially to catch up with the population of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat amused a while ago when the new "regular" from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] rose to find fault with the Democrats over here because the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORRIS] had risen in opposition to the cattle raise. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] had risen in opposition to the butter tax, so that we are about even on that proposition. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Wisconsin wanted to tell us over here about what Mr. Al Smith did and what he did not do, and he wound up by saying that he was proud indeed that he had voted for this rule. I wish to tell the gentleman from Wisconsin one thing, and that is, when he goes out home to explain to his constituents what duties the tariff levies on building materials and the food they consume and the rates on sugar, of which he is in favor at one time and against it at another time, they will keep him explaining through his whole campaign.

It is not a question of what party you belong to when you come to this tariff business, anyway. It just depends on what your constituents think, and on how you are situated. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will yield to the gentleman, although he would not yield to me.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is not afraid to explain his position to his constituents. It would be difficult to explain if he had gone over to the Democrats, because the gentleman knows that almost all of the Democrats are opposed to a protective tariff, and no relief to the cattle raiser and others could come from them.

Mr. McKEOWN. If the gentleman will get more information he will appreciate a little more the Democratic theory of the tariff. I will not take up any more of the time of the committee except to call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], a very able gentleman, to this particular matter: I wanted to ask him a question when he was on his feet, but he did not have time to yield to me. I want to call his attention to what he referred to in the Democratic platform at Houston in reference to the quasi-judicial power to be vested in the Tariff Commission. I want to call his attention to the definition of quasi-judicial power. It is a term applied to the action of governmental officers who are called upon to explain facts and the existence of facts, and to draw conclusions from them as the basis of their official action.

Now, if there is anything in the Democratic platform that calls for quasi-executive power granted to the Tariff Commission, I am unable to find it. I do not understand that there is anything wrong in conferring power on the Tariff Commission when we confer simply quasi-judicial power, and I do not think that the charge of the gentleman from Massachusetts against the Democrats should stand. The Democrats are in this situation on this bill: We have either to take it or leave it, and so we have just to go on and do the best we can under the circumstances. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman believe that the cattle farmers are entitled to this relief?

Mr. McKEOWN. I did not rise in opposition to it. I simply moved to strike out the last word. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment to the committee amendment: Page 109, line 23: Strike out "14" and insert in lieu thereof "15."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL of Wisconsin to the committee amendment: Page 109, line 23, strike out "14" and insert in lieu thereof "15."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. HULL of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on that. I based my first amendment on the testimony given before the Committee on Ways and Means as to the difference between the cost of producing butter in this country and in New Zealand. That was voted down, and I now move to amend by placing the rate of duty at 15 cents, the figure recommended by the national associations of dairy farmers. The suggestion has been made here that if we do not like this tariff on butter we can go to the Tariff Commission and get it raised. We tried that once, and it took us 26 months to get results. If that is the proper manner to get the tariff raised on butter, why not submit the sugar tariff to the Tariff Commission instead of providing for an increased tariff on sugar in this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 138, line 14: After the period insert a new sentence to read as follows: "Shirt collars and cuffs, of cotton, not specially provided for, 30 cents per dozen pieces and 10 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering for the committee simply restores the rate in the present

law. The change was made in an effort at simplification. The committee thought that it was advisable that all cotton wearing apparel should be included in one clause, and therefore this particular item was stricken out. We now ask that the language be restored.

One of the particular reasons for asking this restoration is the fact that it reduces very materially the rate of duty on the articles affected. We have heard a great deal said during this debate about the raising of rates of duty in the textile schedules. I desire to call attention to the fact that this restores a rate of duty which under the present law has been, according to the official textile imports and exports record, 23.85. Since the act of 1922 the equivalent ad valorem rate has been 23.85, and if this amendment is adopted we go back to that schedule, whereas the present bill calls for the rate being made 35 per cent. I therefore call particular attention to the fact that the first textile amendment offered by the committee is a reduction in the rate of duty from the bill as reported by the committee. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 135, line 18, after "velveteens," insert "or velvets."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, this is simply the insertion of an omission that was unintentionally made. The paragraph describes velveteens, and this is to include velvets in order that there shall be no question about their classification under this paragraph of the schedule. There are not many velvets of which cotton is the article of chief value, but there might be some question of proper classification unless specifically named in this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 137, line 7, strike out "30" and insert in lieu thereof "40."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the basket clause of the cotton schedule provides for a rate of 40 per cent ad valorem. Formerly ropes for the transmission of power came in under the basket clause, but owing to a ruling of the Treasury Department they were transferred to a clause bearing 30 per cent. Under the law of 1922 ropes for the transmission of power, belts and belting bore a rate of 40 per cent, and this amendment simply restores the rate of the present law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BACHARACH: Page 64, line 11, after the paragraph number, insert (a), and after line 15 insert a new subparagraph, as follows:

"(b) Autoclaves, catalyst chambers or tubes, converters, reaction chambers, scrubbers, separators, shells, stills, ovens, soakers, penstock pipes, cylinders, containers, drums, and vessels, any of the foregoing (not provided for in paragraph 327) composed wholly or in chief value of iron or steel, by whatever process made, wholly or partly manufactured, if over 20 inches in diameter and having metal walls $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches or more in thickness, and parts for any of the foregoing, 40 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. ESTEP. Mr. Chairman, this change was made by reason of the fact that these particular forgings fall in three different paragraphs under the metal schedule, and as they come into the port of New York there is no definite way for the Customs Service to keep track of the different names under which they come. They are all the same article, but have about a dozen different trade names. Those trade names are now included in the amendment that has been submitted and they have been placed in a separate section in paragraph 319, so that statistics

may be kept by the Tariff Commission and the customs officers as to the imports. The rate under which they would have fallen in the basket clause—and many of them did fall under the basket clause, which is now paragraph 398—was 50 per cent, so that we are changing them over to 319, and they now fall under a rate of 40 per cent, which is a reduction so far as those portions which fall in the basket clause are concerned.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESTEP. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Why does the committee offer an amendment to increase the tariff rate on stills? Is there unfair competition in this country in the still industry?

Mr. ESTEP. I will just suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin that that is the trade name of the forgings that are included in this particular section, and they are not the stills which are used in Wisconsin in violation of the prohibition law.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ESTEP. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I notice that this not only applies to "stills" but it applies to "soakers." Do you reduce the rate on "soakers" the same as you do on "stills"?

Mr. ESTEP. If they come in under paragraph 399, they will have a rate of 10 per cent.

Mr. WINGO. What is the rate now on "stills" and "soakers"? [Laughter.] I am serious about this. These gentlemen do not know what I am talking about nor what you are talking about. I am asking the gentleman a serious question. What is the present rate on "stills" and "soakers"?

Mr. ESTEP. The rates vary. If they come in—as sometimes customhouse officials have permitted these articles to come in—under paragraph 399 and under the new paragraph 398, they would come in under the pending bill at 50 per cent ad valorem. If they come in under 372 as parts of machinery, they would come in at 30 per cent ad valorem; then if they come in under 328, they would come in at 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WINGO. I am talking about the present existing law. Let us assume a 24-inch "still" or a 24-inch "soaker"—

Mr. ESTEP. Forty, thirty, and fifty, dependent upon what paragraph they come in under.

Mr. WINGO. Which paragraph do they come in under?

Mr. ESTEP. All three.

Mr. WINGO. A 24-inch "soaker" comes in under three different classifications?

Mr. ESTEP. Under three different classifications, and we are trying to get them into one paragraph.

Mr. WINGO. So instead of trying to relieve the farmer you are trying to relieve the customhouse of confusion. [Laughter.]

Mr. ESTEP. There is no hardship for the farmer involved, because the rate under the new act is 50 per cent, while the rate under the proposed amendment is 40 per cent.

Mr. WINGO. The farmer from Wisconsin, Mr. SCHAFER, thought you were relieving him on his still. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BACHARACH: Page 74, strike out lines 7 to 14 and insert:

"PAR. 352. Twist and other drill bits, reamers, milling cutters, taps, dies, die heads, and metal-cutting tools of all descriptions, and cutting edges or parts for use in such tools, composed of steel or substitutes for steel, all the foregoing, not specially provided for, 50 per cent ad valorem; if containing more than one-tenth of 1 per cent of vanadium, or more than two-tenths of 1 per cent of tungsten, molybdenum, or chromium, 60 per cent ad valorem. The foregoing rates shall apply whether or not the articles are imported separately or as parts of or attached to machines."

Mr. ESTEP. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for the same reasons I have suggested in connection with the other amendment, namely, to bring together in paragraph 352 all of these carbon steel tools. Some of them now come in under 398 in the pending bill, the new basket clause, and some under 372 and part of them under 352. So we have taken out of 397 certain of these articles and put them over into 352 where they belong, carrying a 50 per cent rate of duty in 352, the same as they do in 397 and in 398.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESTEP. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Under present existing law some of these come in at 30 per cent, do they not?

Mr. ESTEP. If they come in under paragraph 372—

Mr. WINGO. I say some of them do come in at 30 per cent.
Mr. ESTEP. Yes; if they are described as parts of machines, under the rulings of the customs they come in at 30 per cent.

Mr. WINGO. Those that have been coming in under 372 at 30 per cent, under this amendment will come in at 50 per cent?

Mr. ESTEP. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. How large a proportion of those that would come in at 50 per cent would now come in under the lower duty of 30 per cent?

Mr. ESTEP. The gentleman means now?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I suppose a great amount of these imports come from Sweden and from Germany?

Mr. ESTEP. The only ones that come in under the 30 per cent rate are those that have been held to be parts of machines by the customs officials. Ordinarily, there are very few such articles that come in under that description.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am trying to ascertain whether there is any substantial increase over existing law in regard to these drills and the other described machine tools.

Mr. ESTEP. No; because in the existing law we had a great number of them cut out specifically for the purpose of getting statistics on them at the ports of entry and we have simply taken them out of the basket clause and added a few more of them in order that we might get the same kind of statistics.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ESTEP. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. Do I understand that under the present law if these things come in now, attached to farm machinery, they could come in for 30 per cent, but under the gentleman's amendment they would pay 50 per cent?

Mr. ESTEP. No; there is no farm machinery involved. Farm machinery would come in the same as it does now, but the customs officials have held that Congress apparently, in the other act, intended that certain articles should come in under a certain paragraph at a certain rate of duty and the customs officials have held them to be parts of machinery and have put them under another paragraph, but I am sure that was not the intention of Congress, and we are trying to correct that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HADLEY: On page 3, lines 1 and 2, strike out "oleic acid or red oil, 1½ cents per pound."

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, when this amendment is disposed of, if it is approved, I will seek recognition to offer a further committee amendment with respect to stearic acid. This amendment relates to oleic acid, and I speak of them jointly as they are interrelated subjects and might well be considered together. They are joint products and produced from greases and tallows. On reconsideration, since the bill was reported we found that the development in importations is such that the present rates are wholly inadequate, and they are related in such a way that if we do not afford a proper duty upon the one the importations will shift to the other.

In the present law the rate is 1½ cents per pound on each to preserve the proper balance which is necessary. We are preserving that balance here though changing the rates, and the proposal is to strike them both out of paragraph 1, in which event they will fall within the basket clause of that paragraph which is 25 per cent ad valorem.

There is a cartel movement in European countries on these two commodities which is being severely felt in this country by manufacturers. In fact, we are informed through the Tariff Commission that they have already absorbed a considerable portion of the domestic market in Canada and are rapidly invading our own market. Therefore we want to afford more adequate protection in the premises and have doubled the rate approximately by applying to both oleic and stearic acid the 25 per cent ad valorem of the basket clause of paragraph 1.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Is it the purpose of the committee to transfer this to the basket clause?

Mr. HADLEY. Yes; let it fall into the basket clause.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. That would be an increase of 50 per cent?

Mr. HADLEY. It would practically double the rate. The specific rate is now 1½ cents and the differential is more than 3 cents on stearic acid. The proposed ad valorem rate is ap-

proximately double the ad valorem equivalents of the present specific rates.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. There were 55,000,000 pounds produced, and the imports were 78,000 with a rate of 16½. The importations for 1928 were only 46,000, about \$5,900 worth, in the light of 64,000,000 pounds production. I was wondering what facts the gentleman had to justify the increase?

Mr. HADLEY. I intend to offer a second amendment respecting stearic acid. The importation of stearic acid has so enormously increased in the present year—

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I am talking about red oil or oleic acid.

Mr. HADLEY. I understand, but the stearic acid amendment will immediately follow. The importations have enormously increased so that in the first few months of 1929 the imports have amounted to about 20 per cent of the domestic production—and 21.4 per cent of the domestic sales, whereas in the previous year only 6 per cent had been imported. Unless these rates are applied the importations of oleic and stearic acids will continue to increase. The increased duty must be made applicable to both items alike, because if the rate was changed on only one, competition would shift to the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was considered and agreed to.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 6, strike out "stearic acid, 1½ cents per pound."

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have already stated the case of this amendment in my remarks on oleic acid.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 182, line 15, strike out all after the word "paragraph" down to and including the period in line 18, and in lieu thereof insert a comma and the following: "except that any of the foregoing composed wholly or in chief value of china, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthenware, or stoneware shall be classified under this paragraph."

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of cross reference from paragraph 1514, the toy paragraph. Inadvertently the bisque and china doll heads and toy tea sets that are really playthings were included in paragraphs 211 and 212 of the earthenware schedule. This exception places them in the top paragraph 1514 at the regular toy rate, instead of assessing them 10 cents a dozen pieces and 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the paragraph. I do this for the purpose of removing a bit of apprehension that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] expressed just a moment ago. Of course, all of us with him are very much interested in the schedule of duties on farm machinery, and the interrogatory of the gentleman from Nebraska was directed to the gentleman from Pennsylvania touching that point. I thought in order to set his mind at rest, because I know he has great concern over this matter, I will ask him to turn to page 210, paragraph 1604, from which I read:

PAR. 1604. Agricultural implements: Plows, tooth or disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators, threshing machines, cotton gins, machinery for use in the manufacture of sugar, wagons and carts, cream separators valued at not more than \$50 each, and all other agricultural implements of any kind or description, not specially provided for, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

That is under the free list, and I am sure that that will set the gentleman from Nebraska at rest on the matter.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I do not care to occupy further time. I simply wanted to set my friend at ease over the question of whether or not farm implements are taxed.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I am greatly gratified by the answer given by the gentleman from Michigan. I have gone to him before for information and I have never been disappointed. I ask him now if he can give me some information with reference to the effect of this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York respecting the tariff on dolls. In his judgment will this imposition of a tariff as proposed to be changed by the gentleman from New York be less distressing to the American chil-

dren who love dolls than it would if left under the other paragraph?

Mr. KETCHAM. Of course, when the gentleman from Nebraska propounds that question to a young man like myself, when he is a man of more mature years and greater experience and knows more about children than I could ever possibly know, and could answer the question much better than I, I can only leave it to his own good judgment.

Mr. HOWARD. If the gentleman from Michigan can not answer it, then it can not be answered.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of answering the sophistry of the gentleman who has just yielded the floor. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] certainly wants to be fair in his argument and statement of facts. The gentleman says that farm machinery is on the free list. That is true; but the gentleman is not ignorant and certainly knows that the cost of any machinery depends upon the cost of its component parts. If the material out of which machinery is made is high, then the cost of the machine will be high. A tariff that adds to the cost of the material in a machine necessarily adds to the cost of the completed machine. And the gentleman must know that the cost of farm machinery is increased very materially by the tariff, which increases the cost of steel and wire and other articles which go into and become component parts of the machinery. Practically all of the iron, steel, copper, brass, and other materials that enter into the manufacture of farm machinery are enjoying high tariff rates, which materially adds to their cost, and the gentleman knows that the cost of steel and iron and other material entering into farm machinery increases the cost of that machinery to the farmer. If you increase the cost of the material that goes into a plow, you increase the cost of the plow, and this is true of any other machinery.

Mr. KETCHAM. Does the gentleman know that the rates on iron and steel have not been raised?

Mr. LOZIER. Some iron and steel duties may not be raised by this bill, but the duty is already sky-high on practically everything that enters into the manufacture of farm machinery, and the duties should have been reduced. The gentleman does not claim for a moment that the cost of farm machinery is not increased very materially by the excessively high rates on iron and steel?

Mr. KETCHAM. I do.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOZIER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman well knows, being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means—

Mr. LOZIER. But I am not a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the gentleman had that honor. He must know that in the exports from this country of farm machinery to Canada, the American-made farm machinery supplants all others, even in competition with the cheaper-made farm machinery of the world. So that the argument of the gentleman falls to the ground.

Mr. LOZIER. Not at all. The gentleman knows that when it comes to farm machinery no nation in the world has ever been able to meet us in competition, and it would be a joke to place farm machinery on the dutiable list. For years the American manufacturers of farm machinery sold farm implements cheaper abroad than in the United States; but the point I make is that no man on either side of this aisle can truthfully and conscientiously say that the cost of farm machinery is not materially increased by the heavy duties carried upon iron and steel products. Moreover, the pending bill, Schedule 3, increases substantially the duties on metals used in the manufacture of farm machinery. And this will add to the cost of the machinery in which these high-priced metals are used. [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. And the duty on iron was raised 50 per cent in 1928.

Mr. LOZIER. Yes; by proclamation of President Coolidge, about the time he vetoed the McNary-Haugen farm bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CROWTHER: Page 179, line 21, strike out "or" the first time it occurs in such line and insert in lieu thereof "and fancy."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CROWTHER: Page 179, line 1, strike out "7" and insert "3."

Mr. CROWTHER. This is a reduction in duty from 7 cents to 3 cents on bristles. I want to call attention to the fact that there is no bristle industry in the United States. While we have many representatives in various walks of life of the animal that grows them, the evidence before the committee was that the American hog is not allowed to live long enough to have bristles. They all come from China and Russia, and the reduction is in consequence of that fact. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers another committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 197, line 22, strike out "hooks" and insert in lieu thereof "books."

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, this is to correct a mistake. It is fly books instead of fly hooks.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CROWTHER: Page 183, line 11, strike out the figure "11" and insert in lieu thereof "20."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CROWTHER: Page 183, line 13, strike out "1 cent" and insert in lieu thereof "2 cents."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers another committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CROWTHER: Page 194, line 4, after the semicolon insert "vels, veiling, flouncings, all-overs, neck ruffings, flutings, quillings, ruchings, tuckings, insertings, galloons, edgings, trimmings, fringes, gimps, and ornaments; braids, loom woven and ornamented in the process of weaving, or made by hand, or on a lace, knitting, or braiding machine;"

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, this restores the rate in the original act, which was left out inadvertently. This puts the language regarding braids and the description back into the bill again.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CROWTHER: Page 194, line 13, after the word "paragraph," insert "915."

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, that is made as an added exception in 1530. It refers to sueded cotton gloves, which the subcommittee put on the free list, but afterwards reconsidered and they were given a rate of duty that does not mean anything so far as protection is concerned.

The embroidered sueded gloves formerly were classified under the embroidery section of 1530, but this removes them from that paragraph under which probably 70 per cent of the imports had a rate of 75 per cent ad valorem.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CROWTHER: Page 194, line 21, and again in line 22, strike out "and mufflers."

Mr. CROWTHER. The words "and mufflers" are deleted from the handkerchief clause for the reason that the definition of mufflers also includes scarfs, which are frequently made of lace and should fall in section (a) of this paragraph.

This paragraph 1530 of sundries has heretofore been the cause of more litigation in customs courts than all the rest of the schedule, which has 61 paragraphs. This was due largely to the fact that two duties were carried, one of 90 per cent and one of 75 per cent ad valorem, applying, respectively, to laces and embroideries. Much confusion has resulted as to their proper application, and it was deemed wise, as the commodities were in most instances of equal value, to have one rate.

This will manifestly reduce the amount of litigation and will provide adequate protection for American manufacturers.

In 1928 there was imported under this paragraph fabrics and articles of cotton, flax, and so forth, and silk merchandise valued at \$40,648,450. A trifle over \$4,000,000 worth was entered from the Philippine Islands free of duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CROWTHER: Page 207, line 16, after the period, insert a new sentence, as follows: "Cotton wiping rags, 2 cents per pound."

Mr. CROWTHER. Several witnesses appeared before the committee concerning cotton wiping rags. There has been considerable discussion both at the eastern and western ports of entry as to what the duty should be. Some of the customs officers have admitted them free as junk, and others as waste, and some have admitted them under paragraph 1559. We have included them in paragraph 1557 for the sake of simplification of classification. They are specifically named as cotton rags at 2 cents a pound.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell us what wiping rags are?

Mr. CROWTHER. They are cotton rags largely used in engine rooms and around automobile establishments for wiping car bodies, and also used extensively by railroad engineers. They are imported largely from China. They are dirty mill ends which are washed by the natives and then brought here in bales. The collectors at western ports have on several occasions admitted them free while there has been a 10 and a 20 per cent duty levied against them at other ports of entry. They have been a constant source of litigation and we want to classify them as cotton wiping rags and get them where they belong.

Mr. DENISON. What does this amendment do; does it add a duty?

Mr. CROWTHER. This puts on a duty of 2 cents a pound; whereas formerly they came in either free or at 10 or 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DENISON. Will that protect the American industry of wiping rags?

Mr. CROWTHER. I hope so.

Mr. DENISON. Where is that industry located?

Mr. CROWTHER. That industry is located all over the world, wherever there is a factory. This is a waste product—a by-product, if you please—from which there is some source of revenue.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes; gladly.

Mr. COLLIER. I have been told that this important rate on these cotton rags was put on in an effort to appease the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS], the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING], and my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], because they did not get a tariff on cotton.

Mr. CROWTHER. I appreciate the combination of humor and sarcasm, as evidenced by the suggestion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER], but I want to assure him that if it had been in my power so to do I should have had an item in

this bill carrying a 7-cent duty on long-staple cotton for the benefit of the gentleman and the rest of his delightful Dixie friends. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 137, strike out lines 14 and 15, and insert in lieu thereof:

"A warp-knitting machine, 60 per cent ad valorem; made of fabric knit on other than a warp-knitting machine, 50."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] told the story about gloves and mittens, but he got a little ahead of it, because this paragraph had not as yet been amended. He thought we were up to his amendment, but, as a matter of fact, this should have gone in first. However, this accomplishes the exact purpose for which the gentleman gave his explanation. There has been a great deal of argument about fabric gloves and the committee has gone over the matter very carefully. We feel the rates suggested in this amendment offer an opportunity for their manufacture in this country without materially raising the prices to the public.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: Page 223, strike out lines 22 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, this is simply taking those articles off the free list which we have just voted into the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SNELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

FARM RELIEF

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a letter from former Senator Hardwick on farm relief.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a letter from former Senator Hardwick on farm relief. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

SANDERSVILLE, GA., May 20, 1929.

HON. CARL VINSON,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Living as I do in the heart of the Cotton Belt, I am in close touch and contact with our farmers and fully realize the reality and acuteness of their financial distress.

For that reason I have been deeply interested in the debate in both Houses of Congress upon the so-called "farm relief" bill, which is under consideration during this special session of the Congress, and have followed the debate closely.

I do not believe that the House bill, which is undoubtedly the proposal of the administration, can possibly accomplish any real or substantial relief, because many of the evils from which our farmers suffer are beyond legislative cure and because "stabilization corporations" and other agencies provided in the bill will merely withdraw temporarily, from time to time, surplus crops from the market. As long as the surplus remains in existence, unconsumed, it remains a drag on the price almost if not quite as potent in its effect upon the price as if it were not temporarily withdrawn, for the price for the product actually sold is always fixed with regard to the stock on hand, or "in

sight," and the buyer as well as the seller will always take its existence into consideration in fixing the price.

The very little real good that the House bill might accomplish would, in my opinion, be more than overbalanced by the great expense to the Government which this proposal will both immediately and ultimately involve and by the astounding increase in the number and expense of officials and agents of the Government that will thereby be added to our already great and constantly growing army of Federal employees, to the forces of a burdensome and vexatious bureaucracy.

The Senate proposal differs in one important respect only from the House bill. It proposes to add to the proposal of your body the so-called "debenture" plan, by which the Government would pay what amounts to a bounty of one-half of the import duty to the exporters of our agricultural products, giving to such exporters a debenture certificate in the amount of the tariff, which "debenture" certificate is receivable at the customhouse at the rate of 50 cents on the dollar in the payment of duties upon imports.

This amounts to no more or less than a bounty whatever it may be called by its friends or its foes, and without regard to the kind of machinery that is employed to effectuate the purpose.

I am an old-fashioned Democrat and it is passing strange to me to see the leaders of the Democratic Party, in both Houses of Congress, meekly ground arms and abjectly surrender a fundamental principle of our party and one of the soundest doctrines of our system of government.

The Democratic Party has always boasted that it believes in "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." Its opposition to all bounties and subsidies is historic, and up to now, fairly consistent.

Is our agricultural situation so desperate and the statesmanship of our party leaders so sterile and ineffective that in the present crisis it can not rise above the miserable doctrine that one wrong justifies another wrong, in endless circles, until the astounding conclusion is established that while two wrongs may not make a right, three or four wrongs will.

And yet, that is the apologetic basis upon which the Senate debenture plan must mainly rest.

Not only that but if we are to barter our Democratic and American birthright for "a mess of pottage," surely we should do so with enough acumen to be certain that the pottage shall be secured to the men and women who till the soil, in whose interests the bargain is professedly made.

And yet that is exactly what the Senate proposal does not do.

Let us take cotton for the purpose of illustration, though the situation is precisely the same in the case of wheat and all other agricultural products affected by the Senate proposal.

The proposal is to give these so-called "debentures" at the nominal rate of 2 cents per pound of raw cotton and the actual rate of 1 cent per pound, to the cotton concerns actually exporting cotton from our ports for the foreign markets.

No man who actually produces cotton would ever get one penny from these "debentures." It would simply be another case of the middleman absorbing the bounty and the farmer who is simple enough to believe that the export merchants will pass it back to him is simple enough to still believe in a literal Santa Claus.

Nor would the cotton producer get any indirect benefit from the bonus in the shape of an increased price for his cotton (or his wheat).

President Hoover spoke with the authority of a man long and deeply acquainted with the natural operation of the laws of economics, and doubtless with the best advice obtainable on the subject. He may be right in his contention that the only effect of the debenture bonus would be to give the foreign spinner of cotton his raw cotton a cent per pound cheaper than the American spinner could buy it.

For instance, if the world price of cotton were 20 cents when the proposal went into effect, the American spinner would get his raw cotton at 20 cents, while the foreign spinner might be able to get his for 19 cents plus the 1-cent export bounty paid by the Government, thus making 20 cents from the two sources, and maintaining the world price unaffected.

This undoubtedly would be the result unless, as I suspect, the cotton-exporting firms were strong enough in combination to absorb the bounty themselves and force the foreign spinner to pay the same price the domestic spinner was paying.

In either event there is one thing that is certain, the man who actually makes the cotton (or the wheat) would get nothing, either in the shape of an increased price or otherwise.

If we are lacking in ability to construct a new plan to meet the present agricultural emergency, surely we are not so lacking in memory as not to be able to successfully imitate.

The Senate debenture proposal, if it could be enacted, would prove quite as great a "gold brick" for the farmer as the House bill, and that is placing a high estimate upon it. It, however, is hopeless of adoption, and no one knows it better than its sponsors in the Senate.

In my opinion it serves no other purpose, and was intended to serve no other purpose, than to provide a cyclone pit for our "statesmen" at Washington from the cotton and wheat States when they seek in 1930 a political refuge from the wrath of the disappointed and

"gold-bricked" farmers of these sections. If they are really in earnest about actually giving something to the men who with their own hands actually till the soil and produce the crops of the country, something that will certainly reach the empty pockets of these suffering people, why do they not take their lesson from the sugar bounty of the McKinley Tariff Act, and give the bounty directly to the producer?

If they really wish to do it, they can easily deliver these debentures directly into the hands of the farmers themselves. If they do not do so the farmers will never get them.

How can they be sure that the farmers will get the bonus?

By allowing each producer of cotton (or wheat) to make proof, under the provisions of the law, or regulations of the Department of Agriculture, of the amount of cotton actually produced by him before some designated officer of each county in the Cotton Belt, the same to be sent by such officer to the collector of Internal Revenue for each revenue district, and in turn transmitted by the collector to the Treasury Department, which department could then deliver the bounty, through the same channel, directly to the producer.

This, of course, is a direct bounty instead of an indirect one, as suggested in the Senate proposal.

In principle there is not one whit of substantial difference between the two proposals. The real difference is the farmer would actually get the bounty suggested herein, while he would never see, smell, touch, taste, or feel the indirect bounty carried in the Senate proposal.

Besides, if our statesmanship can rise in this crisis beyond mere imitation we could supply in a direct proposal, worked out along the lines of this suggestion, a great safeguard against the peril of stimulation to overproduction, which is either wholly unsupplied or very inadequately supplied in the Senate proposal.

Let me illustrate this peril and the remedy suggested for it, with respect to the cotton crop, though, in my judgment, the case is exactly the same for wheat and all other agricultural products.

If a law were enacted to-morrow giving to each producer of raw cotton a Government bounty of 1 cent or of 2 cents per pound, or of \$5 or \$10 per bale, my fear and belief is that every fence corner and every garden spot in the South would be planted in cotton, and the result would be that the South would produce a superbumper crop. Possibly 20,000,000 bales. If it did, the world price of cotton might drop from 18 cents to 8 cents, and in getting the Government bounty of \$5 or \$10 a bale the cotton producer would lose at least five times as much as the bounty.

No effectual safeguard against such a contingency is contained in the Senate debenture proposal, and none is possible under that plan.

If Congress should, however, vote a direct bounty to the actual producer it could and should limit the bounty to those producers who planted a given acreage of cotton, for instance, in accordance with regulations made by the Department of Agriculture, which department could use this machinery to effectually guard against overproduction, with due allowance for all world conditions.

In that way a check on overproduction could be established which would not only prevent the bounty from falling of its purpose, but might well be even greater aid to the producer than the bounty itself in securing for him a higher price for his product, and would thereby serve so great and useful a public purpose as to justify the bounty, from most standpoints at least.

My deep interest in the agricultural situation and in the pending legislation must be my excuse for the length of this letter.

With best wishes, I am, very truly yours,

THOMAS W. HARDWICK.

EUROPEAN TRADE CONDITIONS—DOMESTIC TRADE SURVEYS—MOROCCO AS AN OUTLET FOR AMERICAN PRODUCTS

MR. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include as a part of the remarks extracts from certain addresses made by Dr. Julius Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, concerning trade conditions in Europe and other matters.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of trade conditions in Europe and to include certain excerpts from addresses made by Mr. Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to do so, I include as a part of these remarks certain portions of statements and addresses recently made and delivered by Dr. Julius Klein, formerly Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and now Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Doctor Klein has recently been abroad in the interest of the work of the Department of Commerce and acquired much very valuable information, the thorough dissemination of which among our people will prove, in my judgment, most helpful. His service as Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Do-

mestic Commerce during the past several years has been, as is well known, of a highly efficient character and has constituted an invaluable factor in the splendid work of the Department of Commerce, so long headed by President Hoover.

Those conversant with Doctor Klein's fine service and abilities congratulate him and the country upon his appointment as Assistant Secretary of Commerce and predict that in his new post of duty he will perform a service no less beneficial and brilliant than he has performed in his former post.

During his recent visit to Europe Doctor Klein attended a conference of the European staff of the United States Department of Commerce at Vienna, Austria, and thereafter, on April 29, 1929, as Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, issued a public statement in regard to economic conditions prevailing in Europe. The substantial portions of that statement follow.

THE EUROPEAN OUTLOOK

The outstanding problem facing American overseas business is still unquestionably the recovery of Europe, both as a customer and as a competitor. The situation across the Atlantic not only has a direct bearing upon the more than one-billion-dollar European market for our agricultural exports, but also for the nearly comparable total of wholly and partly fabricated wares which we sell to the Old World. Together these two items represent over 45 per cent of our total exports, a formidable item not only in its ratio to our entire foreign trade, but in its significance to our whole agricultural and industrial structure.

But these figures only partly present the real significance of European recovery for the economic position of the United States. Every step toward stability and general betterment in the Old World strengthens its demand for the raw materials and luxury products of Latin America and the Far East. The consequent reactions upon the buying power of the latter require no comment. One of the best indicators of the improvement in Europe during 1928 is the fact that our exports to the south of the Rio Grande and across the Pacific increased by \$126,000,000 over 1927, a 9 per cent advance. Although some of this, of course, is traceable to general improvement in American sales methods and to non-European reactions on these markets, there are repeated instances traceable through the records of the Department of Commerce showing an unmistakable connection between European industrial and commercial recovery on the one hand and stimulated trading conditions in important trans-Pacific and Latin American markets on the other.

The profound, literally world-wide significance, therefore, of any progress made toward settlement of the reparations question requires no argument. The repercussions of such a fundamental strengthening of the economic status of the Old World would penetrate to every farmer and factory in this country. There can be no doubt that such an event would also involve a clearing of the decks for competitive action against American exports by European manufacturers on a scale and with an intensity hitherto unprecedented. But a careful survey not only of the trend of European organization for this competition, but particularly of the preparedness of the American manufacturer for it, is by no means discouraging. It also brings out clearly the preponderance of the advantages to be gained by American commerce by every improvement in European buying power as against any possible losses from European competition in neutral markets.

It is thus evident that any prolonged impairment of the European position is a matter of grave concern to every far-sighted American merchant, manufacturer, farmer, lumberman, or other producer. Such uncertainties react upon a host of important commercial factors—fiscal policies, industrial taxation, trade regulations, governmental controls over and participation in commercial enterprises, shipping policies, and so forth.

Although Europe has made notable progress toward stability during the past year, there is still evident an era of anxiety in many major industrial and commercial districts as to the future. This finds expression, for example, in the reluctance of the governments to abandon the war-time practices of close official control over commerce—a regrettable survival of the emergency psychology of the 1914-1918 holocaust.

In spite of the pronouncements of the Geneva Economic Conference of 1927 against such trade barriers, and in spite of some progress that has been made during the past few months in carrying out the recommendations of that conference, particularly in the simplification of statistics and consequent expediting of customs procedure, there are still recurrences of arbitrary trade controls. Nine countries continue to exert, through official channels, various types of restrictions upon trade in motion-picture films from which the United States is the chief sufferer. There are signs, however, of increasingly vehement protests on the part of the ultimate "consumers" against such excessive official controls, some of which regrettably seem to be inspired by political objectives. As long as the unquestioned quality superiority of American films is maintained, we can count upon this potent instance of widespread audiences in their behalf. There is also evident the increasing dependence of the growing European film industry in each case upon foreign markets and its consequently in-

creasing appreciation of the shortsightedness of arbitrary political controls over this increasing trade.

Other manifestations of the survival of the same policy of governmental intrusions into the field of trade are the Norwegian monopolization of cereal and flour imports effective July 1, the Spanish governmental monopoly of the trade in petroleum and its products, which is being followed up by active proposals of similar consortiums controlling the trade in lead, cement, naval stores, etc.; the Czechoslovakian restriction on automobile imports; the arbitrary limitations upon trade in scrap iron, which are fairly general throughout the Continent; elaborate schemes for numerous types of compulsory insurance through governmental agencies, etc. All of these schemes involve, of course, heavy increases in the already staggering burdens of taxation. This fact is at last being appreciated by industry in general, and there is consequently some evidence of increasing reluctance on the part of business leaders to rush to the government for emergency assistance through such controls, restrictions, and various devices.

This question of continued heavy taxation burdens is still one of the major embarrassments in the way of European recovery. In England, for example, national and local taxes absorb more than 20 per cent of the total income of the country. The tax burden has been estimated at about \$100 a year for every man, woman, and child in the land, or something over \$4,000,000,000 annually. The British national debt is \$38,200,000,000, and the service thereon requires about 50 per cent of the total budget receipts. A well-known economist has estimated that the proportion of the national income going to governmental purposes is about 30 per cent in the case of France, 33 per cent in Spain, and 27 per cent in Italy. This situation has naturally roused considerable comment among business circles, which are scrutinizing especially all apparently excessive items of governmental disbursements, not the least of which are those just enumerated in the category of governmental trade monopolies.

Unemployment continues to be the major concern, especially in Germany and England. The problem is not nearly so acute elsewhere in Europe; in fact, it is practically nonexistent in France and Italy. During the past winter the excessively bad weather resulted in a sharp exaggeration in this grave problem, so that the spring found over 2,200,000 unemployed in Germany and 1,200,000 in the United Kingdom. In the former country the coming weeks are to see a readjustment of wage agreements involving 3,000,000 workers, with the problem of wage increases conspicuous in each case. It is hard to see how this situation can be weathered without some material difficulty.

The tendency toward mergers, combinations, cartels, and other types of consolidated industrial effort goes on apace. On the whole, this movement seems to have had a salutary effect; it has undoubtedly stimulated the "rationalization" of many industries through the suppression of weaker plants, the introduction of more up-to-date machinery, and the modification of much hitherto destructive competition. In the case of the textile industry in England there has been a suppression of many weaker mills and an intensified export drive through a large consolidation involving many mills in a group not unlike those authorized under the American Webb-Pomerene law. Notable economies are thus being achieved through mass production, the elimination of excessive style specialization—so long the bane of this industry in Europe—and particularly great economies in joint financing and in the purchase of raw material. This will undoubtedly mean stiffer competition for the American industry. In fact, this is already noticeable in such outstanding specialties of ours as fine hosiery.

The textile distress, however, is still far from solved. All of Europe has felt the loss of the far eastern trade through the establishment of native mills in India and China. For every 7 yards of cotton goods exported by England before the war only 4 yards are now being sold abroad.

Russian recovery continues to present a major problem for Europe. Desperate efforts are being made to rehabilitate this situation through such devices as the recent mission of 100 prominent British business men to the Soviet Republics and the undertaking of similar interchanges of trade groups by other countries. In pre-war years Russia absorbed 9 per cent of Germany's total exports and 3½ per cent in the case of England. These represent, of course, larger ratios in each case than, for example, for any Latin-American market. Until the buying power of Russia is materially strengthened, the export trade of most of the European nations is likely to be materially dislocated.

On the whole, the situation though fraught with these and numerous lesser difficulties is far from discouraging. There seems to be a growing appreciation of the problems involved. Business circles are evidently increasingly impatient with the political difficulties impairing business recovery—the superabundance of political parties and consequent interminable compromises and shifting uncertainties. Industry is at last overcoming its reluctance to write off its losses as did most of the American industries in 1921-22.

Economic assets of all sorts are being marshalled vigorously. The market opportunities of colonies and mandated territories are being exploited with unusual energy through preferential arrangements in

behalf of the mother countries, consolidated-communication services, sharply stimulated steamship activities, etc. The results are evident in such figures as the absorption by the British Empire of nearly 46 per cent last year of England's total exports, as against 35 per cent just before the war. In fact, the Empire takes over a half of England's total manufactured sales abroad. Each Nigerian native buys more British goods than each American citizen. British West Africa is a better market for the mother country than the whole of Spain and Portugal. Ceylon takes twice as much British merchandise as does Russia. Australia and New Zealand, with scarcely 7,500,000 inhabitants, absorb more exports from England than does the whole of South America, or the whole of non-British North America, including the West Indies. This accounts for the strenuous efforts being made by the Imperial Marketing Board in behalf of European trade. It explains also the British anxiety regarding the newly concluded treaty between Germany and the Union of South Africa, which places German goods on a parity with British, so far as any new trade preferences are concerned.

Before any premature lamentations are indulged in regarding the financial frailty of the Old World, it is well to recall that British overseas investments still total approximately \$20,000,000,000, as compared with about \$13,000,000,000 in the case of American holdings—a vast and most powerful trade determinant. A conspicuous feature in this connection is the rise of French international investment activities. In pre-war years the bulk of French surplus capital found its way to Russia. With the elimination of that field there are increasing evidences of powerful French investment activities throughout the Continent and overseas. Many of these are already exerting a conspicuous influence upon exports. In one market for American automobiles, for example, it develops that the financing facilities are largely in French hands, which raises a significant question for the American manufacturers.

An increasingly potent influence in behalf of European recovery is the rapid increase in American tourist traffic. This "trade" added \$900,000,000 to the assets of foreign countries last year, the greater part of that staggering sum having been spent in Europe, and since it pays retail profits, its significance is at least double that of a corresponding sum in import or export figures.

The European situation generally presents thus numerous problems and points of interest for American consumers. Competition is likely to become more intensified for us, notably in the lucrative colonial markets. The British Empire, for example, absorbs over 42 per cent (over \$2,000,000,000 in 1928) of our total exports, and it behooves us, therefore, to be keenly on the alert as to any possible losses in that formidable figure.

A word of caution seems necessary for American merchants in their overlooking the smaller European markets. The total imports of Switzerland, for example, exceed \$530,000,000, which is greater than that of any Latin-American country except Argentina, greater than the nine northern Latin-American Republics put together. Yet our exports to that small Republic are less than \$50,000,000, much of which is not shown in our figures because of the indirect routing of the shipments.

In conclusion, it may be noted that the Department of Commerce is exerting every effort to see that American industry is kept informed as to the dangers of discriminatory tariff rates, the perils involved in the establishment of American branch factories in European countries, the danger of engaging agents carrying entirely too many lines, and particularly the trend of European competition within favored markets.

The outlook on the whole, though by no means free of clouds, is far from discouraging. Continued vigilance, careful foresight, and courageous direction—all virtues which have long marked America's commercial effort overseas—are certain to yield substantial results in this vital market.

DEFECTIVE DISTRIBUTION—OUR GREATEST BUSINESS PROBLEM

On the evening of May 4, 1929, Doctor Klein, as Assistant Secretary of Commerce, delivered over Station WMAL, in Washington, D. C., a radio address on the subject Defective Distribution—Our Greatest Business Problem. In this address Doctor Klein referred to the recent survey of the grocery business in my home city of Louisville. This survey, the first of its kind in our history, was made by our Louisville business men in conjunction with the Department of Commerce. It was highly successful and it has attracted nation-wide attention. Its value to the grocery trade of the entire country has proven so valuable that it will doubtless be followed by other great lines of industry, and the highly important factors of waste, economic distribution, and the like, may be measurably determined with the highest benefit to the producer, salesman, and consumer. The following are extracts from that address:

The high American standard of living gives you your radios, your motor cars, your comfortable homes, your recreations and amusements. And what is the economic groundwork of that living standard? It has two corner stones. One of these is high wages for those who create the Nation's wealth; the other is low prices for consumers.

The broader the spread between the two, the more solid is the pyramid of our economic well-being. This unprecedented prosperity of ours is explainable largely by the fact that what economists call the "real wage"—that is, buying power—has been increasing since 1922 at the rate of 2½ per cent a year, whereas in that time wholesale prices have been falling at the rate of one-tenth of a per cent a year. But from 1896 to 1913 real wages increased only at the rate of one-half of 1 per cent a year, whereas wholesale prices were increasing 2½ per cent a year.

In what direction shall we turn, then, in order to reduce retail prices? We must spread the line of attack, by fighting enemies that have received entirely too little attention in the past.

In the opinion of trained observers and economists, there is not less than eight to ten billion dollars of waste in the conduct of American business every year. That is about as much as the whole of our foreign trade last year in both directions—exports and imports. And there is ample reason to believe that the highest single percentage of this waste arises in the field of distribution.

That is, I am convinced, the gravest issue now before the industrial and commercial community of the country. The efforts of our business machinery to make headway with the present combination of scientific mass production on the one hand and our haphazard, antiquated distribution on the other is like a giant-capacity truck trying to deliver its load of up-to-date, efficiently produced commodities by creeping along the highway of commerce under the power of a 1-cylinder motor of the vintage of 1905.

The economies and laboriously achieved savings represented in the load are largely eaten up by the flagrant, wasteful futility of the distributive power. If distribution is "motion applied to materials" (as it has been defined by one distinguished authority), then certainly much needs to be done before we can rightfully claim to be attaining a satisfactory degree of profitable operation.

Precisely where, we may ask, do these wastes occur—and what are their causes? They arise from such things as excessive expenditure in sales-promotive effort without adequate information as to prospects in a given market, unwise credit methods, unfair practices of small trading minorities, insufficient data as to national stocks of goods, disorderly marketing, particularly of perishables, with resulting gluts and famines, careless and injudicious procedure in the retail trade.

Large sums are needlessly consumed in unsystematic warehousing, in extravagant delivery services, in ill-judged advertising, in unwise installment methods.

Great wastes exist also in the physical movement of merchandise—in packing, handling, and transportation. For instance, it has been found that goods can be handled much more economically through the use of skid platforms—a device which assembles boxes or other containers on a movable board or base. It is utilized in conjunction with trucks or cranes and does away with the need for handling each individual package separately. Direct savings through the use of such simple devices range from 25 per cent to as high as 90. It looks as if, with standardization and interchangeability, we might save ultimately anywhere from \$200,000,000 to \$500,000,000 a year in thus simplifying handling. And that is merely one phase of physical distribution!

We must determine the reasons why our bankruptcy courts are clogged with the tragic wrecks of retailers. In one medium-sized middle western city 30 grocery stores fail every month, involving heavy losses, many of which could be prevented if a watchful eye had been kept on some of these preventable distribution wastes which I have mentioned.

The fundamental American philosophy of lowering prices so as to increase consumption, of mass turnover and minimum margin of profit—those principles which have been so conspicuous in the success of many of our industrial undertakings—can be applied with equal effect to distribution. But such application is possible only if our distributors are prepared to match our producers in the scrutiny of details and in the complete efficiency of their respective processes.

One major effort of the Department of Commerce to curtail distribution losses is through trade surveys of commercial areas of the country. Two of these surveys have been completed—covering, respectively, the six Southeastern States and the New England States. Others are in progress.

They analyze the buying power of each community, its marketing methods, and all factors affecting trading within the region. They show just how people buy, and when, and why, and how much. These studies promise to be invaluable to traders of every class.

Then there are a number of investigations that may justly be called large-scale "clinics" for distribution ailments. Such has been the Louisville grocery survey in the Kentucky metropolis—a truly epoch-making survey carried out in splendid collaboration between public-spirited Louisville business men and this department. We have determined how much it costs to sell groceries, analyzed the eccentricities of consumers, the reasons why grocers fail—and succeed. Everyone who buys groceries has a direct interest in those questions. It has been described as the first comprehensive inquiry ever attempted as to actual

wholesaler-retailer-consumer relations—an effort to get to the bottom of the plight of the retailer, in particular—to answer the question, "What ails him and what can be done about it?"

The results of this survey have already proved of indisputable value. So much so, indeed, that the drug trade of St. Louis, Mo., is making overtures for assistance in a similar survey to cover that metropolis.

The Department of Commerce now has under way a broad-gauge study of credit conditions and problems throughout the Nation—a tremendously vital factor in our present-day system of distribution, especially as to installment selling and credit extension. Surprisingly helpful replies are now coming in from many of the 300,000 firms collaborating in this study under the joint auspices of the National Retail Credit Men's Association and the Department of Commerce.

In order to provide a fund of basic data as to market possibilities, there have been planned a series of handbooks to afford a basis for locating branches and warehouses, planning marketing and advertising activities, to show the competition in the different districts, the sources of income, and the buying power. These practical aids to better business, the first of which, covering New England, has just appeared, combine information in such a manner that the market potentialities of any area or combination of areas may be evaluated readily.

In cooperation with the Baltimore group of controllers, representing 18 large stores, a study is being carried out of the grave and vexatious problem of returned goods. You will be interested to know that the lines which suffer most from this embarrassing "refusal to stay sold"—if I may call it that—are furniture, carpets, oriental rugs, and women's ready-to-wear clothing, in that order. This is a very costly practice for which all of us pay—offenders and innocents. Let us have the facts as to why goods are returned, and what, if anything, is to be done about it.

Next year it is planned to take a nation-wide distribution census in connection with the decennial census of population. This should show just what happens to goods between the time they leave the factory and the time they reach the consumer. It will enable business men to know the total sales of the different types of merchandise and the various types of stores through which they are handled. It will tell us how and where sales are made—in what volume—and the selling methods that are followed.

The Government will shortly reduce the amount of paper in the dollar bill, but we can increase the power in that remaining fragment by prosecuting vigorously this movement to root out economic wastes, especially in slipshod selling; and remember that they are wastes which concern all of us, since we are all consumers. As such it behooves us to view this problem in its effect upon us, not simply its bearing on storekeepers.

The job of being a distributor, and particularly a retailer, does not mean simply an ability to take phone orders and wrap up packages. It involves an application of that well-tried efficiency of ours in production to the vast field of distribution. We must make some headway against that appalling \$8,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000 waste through defective distribution. This can be, perhaps, the greatest move toward enhancing the happiness, comfort, and aspirations of our people.

AWAKENING MOROCCO

On the evening of May 18, 1929, from Station WRC, Washington, D. C., Assistant Secretary of Commerce Klein delivered another address on the subject *Awakening Morocco*. On his recent trip abroad he visited that north African country and made a careful study of trade conditions there. The following interesting extracts from that address are now given:

Among the points of interest to which the crowds of Mediterranean tourists are rushed during their few hours' stop-over in Algiers is a room in the Bey's palace where that potentate once slapped the face of the French consul with his fan. That was the culminating affront in a long series of more serious difficulties which brought about the French intervention in Algiers almost exactly 100 years ago. From Algiers the French zone of influence spread eastward into Tunis in 1881, and finally, just before the World War, the greater part of the old Moorish Empire of Morocco came under the protectorate of France. Morocco embraces about 225,000 square miles (the size of Nevada and Arizona combined), and it has a population of four and a half millions (roughly, as many as the State of Texas), nearly all of whom are Moslems.

From the point of view of our American trade, what is now French Africa is by no means unknown ground. Moroccan leather and hides figured in our imports within a year after the close of the Revolutionary War. Of course, the outstanding point of interest in our early contacts with the southern shores of the Mediterranean was our opposition to the pirates who infested that region. The dramatic episodes associated with the adventures of "Old Ironsides" at Tripoli (now an Italian colony just east of Tunis) and the passionate eloquence of Rutledge in urging "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute," were typical of the first struggling decades in the trading efforts of our young Republic in those troubled, dangerous waters. To-day our commerce there is growing in far more happy—though less stirring—circumstances.

In many ways, Morocco is the most interesting of these areas in northern Africa. It is the last of the three dependencies to be brought into contact with European civilization, and it therefore holds all the rare fascination of a pioneer region. And, in connection with this last point, it is well to remember the important fact that our whole economic history has been one of successful pioneering—culminating in the exploitation of areas in our Southwest, whose geographic and topographic conditions are strikingly like those in northwestern Africa, presenting the same problems of transportation, engineering, irrigation, and general development.

It would seem, therefore, that although the French economic priority in that region is obvious, there are, nevertheless, abundant opportunities for friendly and mutual collaboration with American resources and experience.

Morocco has been described as "a potential California." It has, indeed, snowy mountains corresponding to the Sierra Nevadas of our western Commonwealth (possessing scenic grandeur quite equal to that of many famous spots in Switzerland); with broad, fertile coastal valleys, and stretches of flat stony desert matching the Mohave and Colorado wilderness; and, above all, with a mild climate, except in the southern interior, which has not much to suggest the Golden State.

The history of Morocco glows with the most vivid and contrasted colors. We hear tales of the desperate Battle of the Three Kings and the reign of the so-called Golden Caliph; of the conquest of far-distant Timbuctoo; of the ancient cultivation of philosophy; or, on the other hand, of the ruthless extermination of entire dynasties. We are thrilled, beguiled, or appalled by stories of frenzied fanaticism and of Moslem "saintliness"—the enslavement and torture of foreign seamen—the intervening periods of wise and gentle rule—the pageantry and pride of countless Sultans who, mounted on Arab steeds under gorgeous "imperial umbrellas," compelled foreign ambassadors to approach them bareheaded and on foot.

What does this Morocco mean in terms of trade? What does it mean specifically to Americans? Let us mention, first, that Morocco has a sovereign—the Sultan, under the French protectorate. It has its own currency, treaties, laws, fiscal system, and tariff. In this respect it is entirely different from Algeria, which is to all intents and purposes a part of France (although possessing also an independent currency and fiscal system) and from Tunisia, which is practically a colony of France—a protectorate in name only.

As Consul Russell and his assistant, Vice Consul Henrotin, who so ably look after our commercial interests in French Morocco, have pointed out in a recent report, it is of interest to note that the Sultan of Morocco was the first sovereign after King George the Third of England to recognize the independence of the United States. The first treaty between Morocco and the United States was drawn up in 1787. This was superseded by the treaty of 1836, which is still in force and which gives to the United States a number of important trade privileges, some of which were later confirmed in the act of Algieras in 1906. This last-mentioned international agreement, to which the United States was signatory, granted equality to all nations in the trade of Morocco, including government contracts. This means that French trade, for instance, enjoys no priority so far as tariff rates are concerned, in which respect the Moroccan market is far more favorable from our point of view than the markets of Algeria and Tunis.

There are a number of curious and extremely important treaty privileges enjoyed by American trade in Morocco, which make that market almost unique in the Mediterranean zone. In the first place, the American consular court has complete jurisdiction over American firms and individuals when they are defendants in civil or criminal cases. They are under American laws and exempt from local legislation, except such as is approved by our Department of State. They are exempt from all taxes except customs duties (which average about 12 per cent ad valorem) and a few minor imposts.

Among the singular privileges enjoyed by American commerce in Morocco is the so-called "régime of protected persons." An American firm doing business in Morocco, either import or export, on a large scale is entitled to designate native agents (either Moslems or Jews) in each major center of business. These agents are called "semsars," and they are under the complete jurisdiction of the American consular court as defendants in civil or criminal cases. In fact, they and their immediate families are entitled to practically all the privileges of American citizens in Morocco. This peculiar status is enjoyed by some 20 Moroccans, and is naturally much sought for. The "semsars" are consequently among the most loyal promoters of American commercial interests in the country.

I need hardly say that the buying power and standards of living of the great majority of the 4,500,000 natives of French Morocco are far below those of a corresponding number of Europeans or Americans. Nevertheless, the needs of the country as a whole, in connection with its general development, afford most attractive trade opportunities for American merchandise.

Morocco's imports last year approached \$75,000,000, which is certainly a trade worthy of careful consideration. Among the leading items are sugar—about \$10,000,000 a year—which is consumed in great quantities by the natives in their favorite beverage of "mint tea." The cotton-goods trade amounts also to approximately \$10,000,000, largely supplied by England, with lesser quantities from the European Continent. Incidental household supplies, such as candles and soap, account for \$5,000,000.

One of our great opportunities appears to lie in the field of automobiles, which are greatly in demand on account of the lack of railways and the existence of an excellent system of new roads in Morocco. Coupled with this major item is a splendid demand for petroleum and its derivatives. We also lead in the sale of agricultural machinery and office equipment, for both of which there is a rapidly growing demand.

Our automotive sales, which I mentioned just now, are expanding in gratifying fashion. More than one-quarter of the cars imported last year were American, and at the present rate of import the proportion is likely to be one-half this year. The donkey, which from time immemorial has been the means of locomotion for the Moor, is definitely being replaced by the cheap American car.

The Moroccan market, despite the low per capita purchasing power, is by no means to be dismissed with contempt. It provides some rather curious outlets at times. For instance, a consular report that old clothes would find some demand in Morocco has loosened a quantity of shipments and resulted in substantial profits for one enterprising American company. A well-known American concern on being told that the indispensable American institution of tomato ketchup was unknown among the Moors has now put that tasty condiment into nearly every grocery store of any size. American apples had been heard of but never seen on the local market. On behalf of a local agent the consulate requested cabled offers from certain American firms, and the inquiry has resulted in sales of 700 cases with each steamer leaving the United States directly for Morocco.

In a commercial sense Morocco is a new country and needs all that a new nonmanufacturing country ordinarily requires. Labor has always been plentiful and cheap until the summer of 1928, when a combination of circumstances—including extensive public works and fine crops calling for extra farm labor—doubled the rates of wages. Morocco should soon be ripe for labor-saving machinery of certain kinds. American manufacturers can best enter the market by means of American representatives on the spot, since reliable and competent foreign agents for such purposes are practically unobtainable.

Turning to the exports of French Morocco we find them running to approximately \$48,000,000 last year—a higher figure than usual because of the particularly good crop of cereals. In addition to barley, wheat, and seeds, as well as hides and other animal products, the country is developing its phosphate mines. The exports of phosphate started in 1921 with 8,000 tons, but last year the total was just under 1,400,000 tons. The mines are easily exploited, yield 74 per cent quite uniform quality, can command abundant, very cheap labor, and are only a short distance from the port of Casablanca, where the phosphates are delivered on what is practically a gravity railway. Consequently, the cost of production is low. The extent of these Moroccan phosphate fields is greatly in excess of 150,000,000 tons.

The United States is finding in French Morocco many raw products required by its manufacturers. Formerly purchases of Moroccan produce had to pass through the hands of importers in France, England, or Germany. Now, however, with direct steamship communications, Moroccan exporters are dealing directly with American firms, avoiding the pecuniary liability of passing through a third and unnecessary party.

Exports to the United States have been growing rapidly, having risen from \$320,000 in 1923 to \$1,225,000 in 1928. Aside from the well-known Moorish leather and hides, there is also a curious fiber made from dwarf palms, valuable for automobile upholstery. We also get quantities of canary-bird seed, wild onions, and cork; and last year we bought no less than 1,250,000 pounds of edible snails from our Moorish friends.

Probably one of the best examples of the maxim that trade follows the flag of the merchant marine has been afforded in the development of American commerce with Morocco. About four years ago a regular freight service was established between the two countries, and since that time the shipments in both directions between Morocco and the United States have doubled, and the new line has naturally profited thereby.

But all is not plain sailing for American commerce in this attractive market. A common error is for American firms to intrust their interests in that section to firms located in France. This means all too frequently indirect shipments by way of France, with consequent increase in shipping charges, commissions, etc. Much the better plan is to establish direct relationships with agents in Morocco.

Morocco, then, is very much in the making. It is a romantic land, but, coupled with its picturesque interest, there is also the very attractive phase of an awakening commerce. It is a country in which, commercially, we have much to gain.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LANHAM, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. LARSEN (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS), for two days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, May 25, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 3308) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to grant the use of the Coos Head Military Reservation, in the State of Oregon, to the cities of Marshfield and North Bend, Oreg., both being municipal corporations, for park purposes"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 3309) to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigrant inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JAMES (by request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 3310) to authorize appropriations for the welfare of the enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request of the War Department), a bill (H. R. 3311) to authorize the acquisition of certain tidelands for sewer purposes at Fort Lewis, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 3312) authorizing the States of Illinois and Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near Vincennes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES (by request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 3313) to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire free of cost to the United States the tract of land known as Confederate Stockade Cemetery, situated on Johnstons Island, Sandusky Bay, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request of the War Department), a bill (H. R. 3314) to further amend section 6, act of March 4, 1923, so as to make better provision for the recovery and disposition of bodies of members of the civilian components of the Army who die in line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request of the War Department), a bill (H. R. 3315) to authorize appropriations for expenses of courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, and boards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 3316) to amend section 5a of the national defense act, approved June 4, 1920, providing for placing educational orders for equipment, etc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request of the War Department), a bill (H. R. 3317), to amend "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DAVILA: A bill (H. R. 3318) to modify the contribution of Porto Rico toward the cost of dredging San Juan Harbor, P. R.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STOBBS: Resolution (H. Res. 47) appointing a special committee to inquire into the administration of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau by the Federal Farm Loan Board; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal income tax law so as to provide for the downward revision of taxation on earned incomes and to equalize as far as possible the burden of taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOHN: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Michigan, urging the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal income tax law so as to provide for the downward revision, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 3319) authorizing a survey of Gloucester Harbor and Annisquam River, Mass.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 3320) granting an increase of pension to Rena Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 3321) granting a retirement annuity to T. C. McGowan; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BLACK: A bill (H. R. 3322) for the relief of James Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 3323) for the relief of Kathrine Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3324) granting an increase of pension to George Bunch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 3325) granting an increase of pension to Sarah P. Reid; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 3326) granting an increase of pension to Jane M. Houghton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 3327) granting an increase of pension to Matthew W. Hauck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3328) for the relief of Alexander H. Vivian; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 3329) to authorize the reappointment of George Edwin Penton as second lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 3330) for the relief of James M. Winter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 3331) granting a pension to Emma F. Bock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GABER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 3332) granting an increase of pension to Mary V. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 3333) granting a pension to Lawrence S. Hoffman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 3334) granting a pension to Harriet S. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 3335) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Gettig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES (by request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 3336) for the relief of Western Electric Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: A bill (H. R. 3337) granting a pension to Mary E. Norwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 3338) granting a pension to Harriet I. Van Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3339) granting an increase of pension to Kate Huston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KORELL: A bill (H. R. 3340) granting a pension to Mary Renner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3341) granting a pension to Florence A. Hamlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3342) granting an increase of pension to Hortense J. Gott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3343) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3344) granting an increase of pension to Margaret McGrath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 3345) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Ann Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 3346) granting a pension to Jennie Glass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3347) granting a pension to Nancy Shatto; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3348) granting a pension to Mary E. Beckner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3349) granting a pension to Clara V. Gilmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 3350) granting a pension to Emma Isabel Wank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3351) granting an increase of pension to Myrtie Rockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 3352) to enroll Rosetta McCarter on the final roll of citizens of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians by blood; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 3353) providing for the examination and survey of the Old Channel of the River Rouge; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 3354) granting a pension to Louisa D. Davenport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 3355) for the relief of Willard Thompson, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3356) for the relief of James M. Blankenship; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3357) for the relief of Thomas J. Gardner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3358) for the relief of Louis Martin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3359) for the relief of Frederick Sparks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3360) for the relief of Michael Marley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 3361) granting an increase of pension to Cora A. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 3362) granting a pension to Matilda Swartout; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATRES: A bill (H. R. 3363) for the relief of Melvin Springer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3364) for the relief of Nell Mullen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3365) for the relief of Edward J. Boyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3366) for the relief of Patrick J. Langan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3367) for the relief of John Magill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3368) for the relief of Joseph Marko; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3369) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Finney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3370) granting an increase of pension to Edward Sweeney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3371) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 3372) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Cheuvront; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3373) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Free; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3374) granting a pension to Elizabeth Simons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3375) granting a pension to Idella F. Lemmons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3376) granting a pension to Naomi S. Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3377) granting a pension to Ephriam (Malcom) Malcolm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3378) granting a pension to Missouri Grimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3379) granting a pension to Jerome C. Frum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3380) granting a pension to Cortes Stephenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 3381) granting an increase of pension to Julia Plummer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

500. By Mr. BOHN: Petition of House of Representatives of Michigan, to amend Federal income tax law so as to provide for the downward revision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

501. By Mr. CONNOLLY: Resolution adopted at a joint meeting of representatives of manufacturers and workers in the kid-leather industry in Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey, petitioning Congress for a 20 per cent duty on finished kid leather imported into the United States and 30 per cent on glove leathers and leathers made from the skins of reptiles and fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

502. By Mr. COYLE: Memorial of Palmerton Council, No. 199, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, Palmerton, Pa., urging the enforcement of the national-origins clause of the 1924 immigration law and opposing any repeal or further postponement of this clause; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

503. Also, memorial of Pride of Easton Council, No. 66, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, Easton, Pa., strongly urging against any repeal or further postponement of the national-origins provision of the 1924 immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

504. Also, memorial of the Pennsylvania State Beekeepers' Association, in annual meeting, January 23, 1929, strenuously opposing all changes that impair the integrity of the United States pure food laws, and having especial reference to House bill 2154 and Senate bill 685, Seventy-first Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

505. Also, memorial of South Easton Council, No. 590, Fraternal Patriotic Americans, Easton, Pa., protesting against any repeal of the national-origins provision of the 1924 immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

506. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, requesting recognition by Congress of the national interest in the forest resources of the country, and that the program approved by Congress last year in regard to making an investigation should be placed in effect at once through substantial appropriations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

507. Also; petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, respectfully protesting against the advancement of House bill 121 as being destructive rather than constructive legislation, containing as it does provisions that are most drastic in their application, if, indeed, they are not impossible to comply with under present conditions in the trade; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

508. Also, petition of the New York State Association of Manufacturing Retail Bakers, deprecating efforts made in Congress, as set forth in pending tariff legislation, to increase the cost of foodstuffs to the American public by higher tariff on raw materials entering into the cost of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

509. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of the Wallpaper Importers' Association, in regard to the proposed rates on wall paper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

510. Also, petition of W. E. Miller, general manager Coignet Chemical Products Co. (Inc.), New York City, opposing additional protection to gelatines and glues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

511. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of A. D. Thompson and other citizens of Marshall County, Ky., urging the enactment of a law authorizing payment of pensions to widows and dependents of veterans of the World War who are not now entitled to receive dependency compensation; to the Committee on Pensions.

512. By Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts: Petition of the Charitable Irish Society, John J. Keenan, secretary, 615 Scollay Building, 40 Court Street, Boston, Mass., unanimously urging repeal or postponement of the so-called national-origins clause in the immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

SATURDAY, May 25, 1929

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 16, 1929)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fess	Johnson	Sheppard
Barkley	Fletcher	Jones	Shortridge
Bingham	Frazier	Kean	Simmons
Black	George	Kendrick	Smith
Blaine	Gillett	Keyes	Smoot
Blease	Glass	King	Stephens
Borah	Glenn	La Follette	Swanson
Bratton	Goff	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Goldsborough	McMaster	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Gould	McNary	Trammell
Burton	Greene	Norbeck	Tydings
Capper	Hale	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Harris	Nye	Walcott
Connally	Harrison	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Hastings	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Hatfield	Patterson	Warren
Cutting	Hawes	Pine	Waterman
Dale	Hayden	Pittman	Watson
Deneen	Hebert	Reed	Wheeler
Dill	Heflin	Robinson, Ind.	
Edge	Howell	Sackett	

Mr. HAYDEN. My colleague the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had

affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 616) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the world jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, and it was signed by the Vice President.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AIRPORT FACILITIES (S. DOC. NO. 13)

Mr. BINGHAM, from the Joint Commission on Airports, submitted, pursuant to law, a preliminary report relative to the matter of airport facilities for the National Capital and the District of Columbia, which was ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Joint Commission on Airports created under the authority of Public Resolution No. 106, Seventieth Congress, approved March 4, 1929, presents the following in the nature of a preliminary report:

The commission organized on March 6, 1929, and proceeded to consider the problem of formulating recommendations to Congress for providing the National Capital and the District of Columbia with adequate airport facilities. At the outset of its deliberations the joint commission, upon an expression of opinion on the part of its members, declared itself to be a unit in the conviction that these facilities should be not only sufficient for present and anticipated aviation needs so as to serve Washington's maximum requirements but also of an extent and completeness that should reflect the Capital's national leadership and become a model for other cities in their development of municipal aids to aviation.

As a preliminary step to that end, the commission solicited and readily obtained assurance of cooperation from the various governmental departments concerned as well as from the government of the District of Columbia, and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission—an assurance that, the commission is happy to acknowledge, has been abundantly fulfilled.

In order that the board might be in possession of expert opinion and advice bearing on its problem, a series of public hearings was inaugurated, which extended over a period from April 8 to 30, 1929, and brought together a notable coterie of foremost airport engineers and aviation experts, including the managers of the Cleveland, Buffalo, and Ford Airports; the chief engineer of the city of Baltimore; Assistant Secretaries for Aviation in the War, Navy, and Commerce Departments; noted fliers of those governmental branches and of the air mail; and last, but by no means least in imparting worthwhile information, Col. Charles A. Lindbergh. The statements of these and other witnesses before the board are embodied in a volume of hearings comprising 196 pages, that has been pronounced by persons qualified to judge to be a very satisfactory compendium of information on the subject of municipal airports.

Coincidental with the assembling of these data, the joint commission has been making, and is still engaged in, a study of available sites for an airport in the vicinity of the Capital City, and in this investigation has had the benefit of the technical knowledge of requirements and the engineering training possessed by Maj. Donald A. Davison, the assistant engineer commissioner of the District of Columbia, and Maj. Carey H. Brown, Assistant Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital.

These suggested sites number more than a score, many of them possessing advantages of one nature or another, but not all of them by any means suited to the needs of the Capital in this respect. Various factors entering into the solution of the problem must be and are being studied, such as distance from the civic and business center of the city, accessibility by highways and means of overland transportation, altitude, contour of ground, drainage, the prevalence of fog, and situation respecting prevailing wind directions, together with the cost of land and the probable expense of grading and development.

The joint commission is still at work on this many-sided inquiry, and is unable to submit a circumstantial report until more is learned about properties available for airport purposes and the cost thereof.

Believing that the most economical method of procedure, and the course best suited to the interests of all concerned, is to authorize the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to acquire lands for airport purposes, or options for such purchase, subject to the approval of this joint commission, the commission recommends legislation making an appropriation of \$500,000 for that purpose, and suggests the immediate passage of the following joint resolution:

Joint resolution making an appropriation for the acquisition of lands for an airport or airports for the National Capital and the District of Columbia

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$500,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, for the acquisition by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, subject to the approval of the Joint Commission on Airports, of lands, and/or options to purchase lands, for an airport or airports adequate for the needs of the National Capital and the District of Columbia.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows: